FATHER INDIA

A Reply to *Mother India*

BY

C. S. RANGA IYER

MEMBER OF THE INDIAN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

LONDON

SELWYN & BLOUNT LTD.

6 DUKE STREET ADELPHI W.C.2.

FOREWORD

THE language of genuine pleasure is brief. At the outset I must thank an English gentleman—whose modesty forbids me to name him—who has been of no small help to me in arranging the publication of this book. This Englishman and his family, as can be proudly claimed, have for generations served India for England.

C. S. RANGA IYER.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I

SLANDERING A NATION

" 'Tis Slander
Whose edge is sharper than the sword
Whose tongue
Outvenoms all the worms of Nile,
Whose breath
Rides on the posting winds and doth belie
All corners of the world. . . ."

SHAKESPEARE.

Two visitors went to India from the West, an Englishman of culture and an American woman of conceit. Both of them have recorded their impressions.

The Englishman named his book *Jesting Pilate.** " 'What is Truth?' said Jesting Pilate, and would not stay for an answer." With this great thought of Francis Bacon, the Englishman began "the diary of a journey." He has said very unpleasant things in a pleasant way, for he had no desire to hurt; he wished to help. He has the sympathy which comes from culture and breeding. He moved

* London: Chatto & Windus, by Aldous Huxley.

among the brown Aryans and the dark aborigines of Asia to see and to know. He wrote what he saw and felt. His style is literary, because he is a scholar.

Satirically, the American tourist calls her book *Mother India*, in whose name the English-hating Nationalist appeals to the masses. "Mother India," "Motherland" and "Bandemataram" (Hail! Motherland) are phrases which the anti-Indian loathes. The American who lived and moved in the anti-Indian circles imbibed their sentiment. Her book, which breathes their scorn, is a tirade on India, written in the style of a Cassandra-like propagandist. It slanders a great and simple-hearted nation of ancient descent.

It is said that, in early times, in the city of New York, slander was esteemed a rank offence. The story runs that one Jan Adamzen was condemned to be "struck through the tongue with a red-hot iron and banished from the Province" for slandering certain respectable persons. Modern New York is no longer unsafe for slanderers, especially as the slandered happen to belong to another hemisphere.

Unlike Aldous Huxley, the English scholar and writer, Miss Katherine Mayo, for that is the name of the American propagandist, went to the India Office in London and the Government Houses in India and told them her plans. She left the United States, apparently, with a set purpose to write a popular book. A book to be popular must

be sensational. A sensational book must deal with the sex-side. Shocking things must be expressed either with cool courage or holy horror. A woman is best qualified for the job; if she can " fire off " in the yellow press style, she can command a good sale. Give the lady her due; Miss Mayo does the job thoroughly well; good, on the whole, from the sensuous and the sensational standpoint. The tourist authoress deserves all the limelight of the world.

After attributing to Mother India the worst diseases of this planet, she sounds a note of warning. India is to be treated as a pariah by the League of Nations: "All the civilized countries of the world must demand protection against her." India is the world's slum-land, dung-heap, and cholera-carrier. When, in 1893, cholera attacked the United States, Miss Mayo was sure that the germs were carried from India by some healthy tourists, and healthy people can carry cholera germs, she says. " As the speed of travel from East to West is more rapid than before, the danger is greater." Bengal is the world's worst place because it has terrorists, politics and cholera! All these do not shock; they but make one laugh. They show a queer imagination rather than give any true information. The American author, to inform herself, goes to the venereal hospitals and other plague-spots. After collecting her materials, she tells the world: " I have gone and seen; every Indian is impotent after twenty-six and men

and women have either gonorrhœa or syphilis or both."

India has one-fifth of the world's population. In Morley's picturesque phrase, she has been walking for years in the corridor of time. She always lived, and lives even to-day, in inaccessible villages, half a million in number. Some old English officials who knew India better warned Miss Mayo against generalizing; some bad ones perhaps inspired her. After visiting a few hospitals the lady boldly reviles a whole nation. As well might an oriental edition of the authoress visit a hospital in New York, another in Chicago and a third in San Francisco, make similar sweeping generalizations, and return home a living monument of the maxim:

> "The fool that has been taught to roam
> Excels the fool that has been left at home."

Miss Mayo, however, is far from foolish; she is extremely clever. Her mission is to prove that coloured people are not fit for freedom. It is her zeal alone that must be held responsible for all the awful things she says about India and Indians. Her end is noble to discredit India, her vaunted spirituality and culture; untruths and half-truths are the means. The end justifies the means!

Burke wondered whether anybody could indict a whole nation. Burke was a backward Briton and belonged to the eighteenth century. Miss

Katherine Mayo is a forward American spinster and aspires to belong to the twenty-first century !

For your background have some seeming truth, and you are safe to build thereon a mountain of lies. Visit one or two hospitals and say that the whole nation has all the diseases with which the patients are afflicted. There are five *lakhs* of villages in India. If you give one day for a village, it takes 500,000 days to visit all the villages in India. The average life for American women, let us suppose, is seventy years. Suppose Miss Mayo happens to live for one hundred years more, she would be breaking the record of longevity of any man or woman in the twentieth or perhaps even the twenty-first century. Suppose again that she devotes one day for each village in India and travels by the latest American aeroplane, because one village is distant from the other, there are no motor roads and the country carts drawn by bullocks will waste a whole half-day which could be usefully spent by the tourist, who told the India Office she was "seeking test facts to lay before my own people." If at the end of her hundred years' tour she writes, she could be said to have visited at least 36,000 out of 500,000 villages and therefore examined the truth on the spot. But what does she do? She starts with a set plan—to write a book. She goes to the India Office in London, as she confesses, the very best place to know one side of the shield but the very last place one would visit, if one wanted to

know also the untarnished unofficial truth; because the so-called India Office is really the British Foreign Office in London responsible for keeping the British administration in India going.

Be that as it may, she could not have put to more improper use all the assistance given to her by the India Office than the gross misrepresentation of India and its culture, its people and their customs in which she indulges. If she wanted to produce estrangement between Great Britain and India, she could not have done better than produce *Mother India*. No wonder the far-sighted Englishmen who know India have written to the press protesting against the publication. Well may they feel: "Save us from our tourist-friends!"

CHAPTER II

THE AMERICAN MISS AND THE BENGAL TERRORIST

"The world with calumny abounds,
The whitest virtue slander wounds,
There are whose joy is night and day
To talk a character away;
Eager from rout to rout they haste
To blast the generous and the chaste,
And hunting reputation down
Proclaim their triumphs through the town."

ALEXANDER POPE.

MUCH has been written of terrorism in Bengal. Bombs and pistols were said by sensational writers in America to be raining death in the streets of Calcutta, and terrorists were hiding in the bushes of the suburbs, only to sally forward to take the life of an Englishman, a police officer or a loyalist. Attempt was made even to wreck a special train of the Governor of Bengal. It was hardly a place for the Viceroy and the capital of India. The fates ordained that the capital be removed to far-off Delhi and seated in a wilderness,

peopled with rabbits and jackals. The jungle was cleared, the rabbits and jackals disappeared, and the new capital was raised. In his posthumous works * Lord Curzon deplored the shocking extravagance of New Delhi which India could not afford.

Official repression and Mahatma Gandhi broke the anarchist movement. Repression drove the movement underground and kept its alleged leaders in prisons in marshy villages. When they were released they rallied to Gandhi's banner and responded to his appeal for non-violence as the harp responds to the harper's touch. From their response one wonders whether they could have really belonged to the terrorist movement. They know, their friends know and God knows; not Miss Mayo, whose source of information goodness knows.

Whatever the history of the past, there is no terrorist movement in Bengal to-day. Honest Englishmen admit it. The American tourist says she saw with her own eyes: "In the courts and alleys and bazaars many *little* bookstalls, where narrow-chested, near-sighted, anaemic young Indian students in native dress brood over piles of fly-blown Russian pamphlets." And so they were put in jail without trial? No public trial is needed when the Government of India and Bengal and an "unsubsidized, unattached" American lady say there is terrorism in Bengal. How dare any-

* *The Government of India*, by Lord Curzon.

one deny it ! Be they Liberals or Loyalists, all Indians are a set of liars. It is their religion that makes them so, according to Miss Mayo. As against the word of the Indians is the deed of the Government.

The revolutionary agitators for India's freedom were denied a trial not because there was no evidence, but because no open trial was possible. Judges might be shot, witnesses would be intimidated. Surely if the situation were so bad, the English Government would have returned to Whitehall long ago. The truth is they have no other material than what the police had supplied them with, which cannot stand the scrutiny of a court of law. And who, pray, are the police? Let Miss Mayo speak: "Their greatest virtue lies in the chance it gives them to fill their pockets." When the late lamented C. R. Das was Lord Mayor of the Second City of the British Empire, and Subash Bose, I.C.S., who had joined the ranks of Das and Gandhi, was the Executive Officer of the Calcutta Corporation, the police must have been in distress, because they were men of honour. Subash would be the last man "to fill their pockets." What wonder, then, if he became the *bête noir* of the police? He gave all his handsome pay for the education of poor students. Then there is Miss Mayo's evidence that in the streets were boys who read "fly-blown Russian pamphlets." Given imagination, here is enough material for the police to manipulate. The police evidence was never

brought before a court of law and tested in a trial, obviously because it could not stand the test. Even Subash Bose does not know the crime for which he was put in jail. A strong, healthy man, working for fifteen hours a day; that was Subash Bose when the police took him away one fine morning. Others who were his friends were also taken away and lodged in prison. Prison broke Subash's health. He was dangerously ill with tuberculosis, according to the official report, and therefore safely released. Over three years of imprisonment without trial has played havoc on the health of the coming man of India and Bengal. Others who are not dangerously ill will continue to rot in prison.

The High Court judges were asked to examine every individual case in confidence, but they declined to do so. How could His Majesty's judges do work for the executive? Yet Miss Mayo says that Indian judges are corrupt.

Macaulay wrote that the Castilians had a proverb that in Valencia the earth was water and men were women, and that was true of Bengal. Miss Mayo would consider Macaulay's statement as an aspersion on women, for the Bengalees are weaker than women, a pack of cowards, clerks and platform speakers afflicted with all conceivable and inconceivable diseases. How, then, could they face the gallows with a smile? How could they go through the hell-fire of prisons? How could they engineer a terrorist movement?

"Ah, yes," says Miss Mayo, "there is a terrorist movement and its cause is over-sexuality and venereal disease." Miss Mayo is, I am told, a doctor and, therefore, her diagnosis ought to be treated only as scientific propaganda !

The fantastic diagnosis of a terrorist movement being rooted in the unspeakable sexualism of the East must be told in the author's own words. Indians who know their country better say it is all lies. Miss Mayo says it is the truth, the whole truth. Let us string her pearls. "The Indian girl, in common practice, looks for motherhood nine months after reaching puberty or anywhere between the ages of fourteen and eight ! As to the husband, he may be a child scarcely older than herself or he may be a widower of fifty when first he requires of her his conjugal rites." "The little mother goes through a destructive pregnancy." "The infant that survives the birth-stain—a feeble creature at best, bankrupt in bone-stuff and vitality, often venereally poisoned." "Given men who enter the world physical bankrupts out of a bankrupt stock," "unrestrained outpouring of their whole provision of creative energy in one single direction," "broken-nerved, low-spirited, petulant ancients poor and sick and dying ; their hands are too weak, too fluttering, to seize or to hold the reins of government." But how can the sick and shaking hands throw a bomb or fire a pistol, much less organize a terrorist movement to disturb the sleep of the Governor

and the Viceroy, who concoct an ordinance and arrange the police invasion of their houses in the small hours of the morning and arrest them?

"Yes," says Miss Mayo, "you do not know it is all due to the 'over-sexuality.' Bengal is the seat of bitter political unrest, the producer of India's main crop of anarchists, bomb-throwers and assassins. Bengal is also among the most sexually exaggerated regions of India; and medical and police authorities in any country observe the link between that quality and queer criminal minds."

Is Miss Mayo a police authority? No. She professes to be "an ordinary American citizen"; she is modest. She is really extraordinary. Her diagnosis certainly is. But why should she publish such a wild thing? Has she been set up? Oh, no! She says she is "a volunteer unsubsidized, uncommitted and unattached"!

The Indian newspapers wonder why she should protest so much. "My lady doth protest too much," because it is easy to give a dog a bad name and hang it.

CHAPTER III

GIRL-MOTHERS

> "How oft that virtue which some women boast
> And pride themselves in is but an empty name."
>
> PHILIP FROUDE.

"THE Indian girl," says Miss Mayo, "in common practice looks for motherhood nine months after reaching puberty or anywhere between the ages of fourteen and eight. The latter age is extreme, although in some cases not exceptional: the former is well above the average."

Miss Mayo is, therefore, prepared to concede that the average age at which an Indian girl attains puberty is fourteen. Her statement about girls of eight attaining puberty and aspiring for motherhood is an untruth. But I admit that girl-mothers of fourteen are by no means an exception in India, though not the general rule

Early marriage is not part of Indian culture. In the Vedas, one finds no sanction for it. The Vedas are the ancient scripture of the Hindus.

What the Bible is to the Christian, the Vedas are to the Hindu. Miss Mayo has quoted from so-called scriptural texts, but she has throughout her work carefully avoided a single quotation from the Vedas. Her object is clear. She wants to deny even the ancient culture of the Hindu race. The Hindus were barbarians in the beginning of time; they are barbarians at the present time; they will remain barbarians till the end of time. This is her theme; this the purpose of her book. In the morning of the world, as Western scholars like Professor Max Muller have admitted, the Hindus had attained a high level of culture and civilization. Women chose their own husbands. The story of King Nala, which dates back to ten thousand years before Christ, the references in ancient books to the ceremony of *Swayamvara* (choice of the bridegroom by the bride) show that the woman of ancient India had as much privilege as the American woman of to-day. The epic of Ramayana, the story of Rama's marriage to Sita, also shows that cultured girls chose for their husbands men of culture, character and valour. Sita was a very beautiful girl, the adopted daughter of Emperor Janaka. There were several suitors for her hand, but she rejected them all. She wanted to marry Rama, the Crown Prince of Ayodhya. Knowing the strength and prowess of Rama, she had consented to challenge her innumerable suitors to bend a bow which Rama alone could bend. That was

the age of archery; her suitors failed; Rama succeeded.

Coming down to a subsequent period, 3000 B.C., the custom had undergone a change. Women enjoyed even more liberty than before. *Gandarva vivav* (secret marriages) were by no means uncommon. Arjun, the famous hero of Mahabhar (in the big war in which all Indian kings took sides), eloped with Krishnà's sister and married her. Kunti, the mother of the Pandava heroes, had a son before her marriage, who became later on the famous Karuna growing in obscurity, not knowing his mother.

Between this period and the period in which we find the liberties of women considerably curtailed there is not much literature to guide us. Presumably there was a sex war in which man rose superior to woman, and abolished all her rights and liberties. The coming of the Muslims, whose religion confined women to an inferior place, completed the overthrow of the feminine sex. In the nineteenth century Rishi Dayananda Saraswathi, not an English educated man but a Sanskrit scholar, came as a Messiah to preach the restoration of women to their ancient pedestal of glory. Himself a strict Brahmachari (celebate), the Sanyasi (monk) took up arms against a sea of social troubles, not the least of which was child marriage. Marriages of girls eleven and twelve are not in practice amongst the orthodox Arya-Samajists and other followers of the Rishi who do

not label themselves Samagists. They constitute roughly a tenth of India's population. We must also note that the followers of Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Keshab Chandra Sen do not marry their children young. We have the Sikhs, followers of the Gurus, amongst whom marriage of fully grown-up girls of seventeen and twenty-one is a common practice. The only section among which child marriage is of very common occurrence is the Brahmin, especially of the Madras Presidency. The members of the Legislative Assembly, whom Miss Mayo quotes as upholders of the obnoxious custom, are the Brahmins of Madras. Those whom she quotes as having defied it are not Brahmins by caste. Not that all Brahmins swear by child marriage. Some of the truest social reformers are the Brahmins of Madras. To break the tyranny of custom a Madras Brahmin, none other than the Right Hon. Srinivasa Sastri, who represented India at the Imperial Conference in London, introduced about a decade ago in the Provincial Legislative Council what was known as "The Post Puberty Marriage Bill."

Pre-puberty betrothals (miscalled marriages) take place among the Brahmins. It is necessary to see what these marriages are. The girl is generally between ten and thirteen years of age and the boy between sixteen and twenty-two. *The marriage "ceremony," as it is called, is celebrated in the house of the girl, in the presence of* the hosts and the guests, who include their numerous

friends, men and women. By the way, women play the principal part in these ceremonies. Several *slokas* are recited from the Vedas; the boy and the girl, holding each other's hands and going round the sacred fire, promise solemnly in the presence of the assembly "to have and to hold for better and for worse, in sickness and in health till death shall part them." Then the boy goes back to his home and the girl remains at hers. Another ceremony follows, called "*grahapravesham*" (entering the husband's house), which the girl does with her parents and people. The girl does not meet the boy in private. She returns home, with her people. After she attains puberty, a third celebration takes place called in Tamil *Darakshi Kalayanam* (nuptial marriage). Call this primitive, if you will. In India, in primitive times, the system of marriage which prevailed was more like the modern one which obtains in the civilized world and less like the one that prevails there to-day.

It must be noted that this system of child-betrothal prevails generally only among the Brahmins and especially those of the Presidency of Madras, who are a very small fraction of the Indian population, one in a thousand. The Brahmin custom is presumably a result of a violent reaction from *the excess of liberty in the matter of marriages which once prevailed in India* and the results of which are dreadful to-day in the

United States of America, as disclosed by a competent judge.*

Contrast with Miss Mayo's stray visitations to hospitals and plague spots for her statistics, based on the cursory views of a tourist, with Judge Lindsey's conclusions from his careful study of the morals of the public schools and abundant intimate personal contact with the boys and girls of those schools extending over a period of twenty-five years. Miss Mayo's conversations were obviously with prejudiced people. Her purpose was frankly political. Judge Lindsey is an aggressive social reformer who wants radically to change existing customs and systems with a view to improve the condition of the United States.

What is the condition? "The first item in the testimony of these high schools is that all the youth who go to parties, attend dances and ride together in automobiles more than ninety per cent. indulge in hugging and kissing. . . . The testimony I receive regarding this estimated ninety per cent. is practically unanimous." . . . "Some girls insist on this kind of thing and from boys that go with them and are as aggressive in a subtle way, in their search for such thrills as are the boys themselves."

After dealing with the type of American girl

---

* *Revolt of Modern Youth.* By Judge Ben B. Lindsey, New York.

which matures early, as early be it noted as in India, " which feels the urge of sex years before the mind has grown sufficiently mature to cope with it and control it," the learned judge writes of the " flapper world, which contains another type of girl, who is not necessarily over-sexed at her age, but who nevertheless permits boys to take liberties with her as a kind of reward for dancing with her and showing her what she calls a good time." These girls are not drawn from the lower classes. " I have," says the judge, " whenever possible, picked my witnesses from representative homes of reasonable wealth and considerable culture." These girls, it is necessary to say, are girls ranging in age from fourteen to seventeen. *It may be said by Miss Mayo that kissing* and hugging are no crime. Not kissing and hugging only, Miss Mayo, but a particular kind of dancing, the style of which the judge records in the words of a typical girl who uses boys as dancing partners.

" Don't you resent the way they dance," enquired the Judge. " Do you mean the button shining ? " she asked casually. " Not at all, close dancing affects some girls."

" I am telling you the truth," she went on. " Most of the girls don't get any special thrill out of close dancing. We do get a thrill out of the dancing itself, and we go to parties with these young crumpet munchers and snuggle pups because we like to dance and for no other reason."

"And the—er—crumpet munchers?" asked the Judge, trying to snap the words out the way she did. "They dance for the kick they get out of it," replied the girl promptly.

"In the dancing," put in the Judge.

"Yes, in the dancing," came the answer; "holding the girl close, you know. And afterwards, in petting, heavy-necking and other things if she stands for it. I don't."

"But," said the Judge, "why, why do you stand for the close dancing? When they get a kick out of the dancing, as you put it, don't you feel that they are taking liberties with your person?"

To which the girl said, "What those young fools get out of it is nothing to me. Why should I bother my head about what they think; if they want to make themselves miserable, that's their affair. I should worry. Let them boil. Don't I get the dance and after the dance, why, I'm through with them."

The Judge emphasises that these are the opinions of young women of good breeding.

Miss Mayo may say, "Well, it is only dancing"; but the Judge says such views are held secretly, *and such tricks practised without their guardians' or teachers' or parents' knowing, for they come* from "homes where the entrance of such views as these are completely revolutionary, or would be so if they were suspected." So much for ninety per cent. of the girls of the country to which Miss Mayo belongs. From the oriental standpoint this

is immoral. Such is the sex atmosphere in which the girls of America live.

Miss Mayo may say, "After all, kissing and hugging and dancing of that sort, because it is after all dancing, may be passed over." The mischief, however, only begins there. Where it leads to and the extent of havoc it plays on the morals of the young women of the United States are best expressed in the Judge's own words:

"At least fifty per cent. of those who begin with hugging and kissing do not restrict themselves to that, but go further, and indulge in other sex liberties which, by all the conventions, are *outrageously improper*." (The italics are mine.) "These familiarities, quite apart from the obvious danger that they will lead to other things, are responsible for much nervous trouble among young girls and for the prevalence of certain physical ailments which are peculiar to them. Of this fact most parents and teachers are completely ignorant." The Judge then gives the opinion of eminent physicians "that so far as the moral and physical results are concerned, the effect of such half-way improprieties on these young girls is just as dangerous as if they yielded themselves completely." The Judge is bitter on the existing customs and codes that regulate life in America.

"The conclusion I draw from the fact that fifty per cent. of the original ninety per cent. indulge in half-way sex intimacies that wreck the health and morals alike, is that here is an

example of the effects on human life of false and illogical thinking, or, if you will, logical thinking based on false premises. Such is the fruit of some of the most stubbornly cherished of our primitive traditions, of our lives, our hypocrisies and concealments, and our unwillingness to face the facts of sex."

Miss Mayo has much food for thought in the foregoing passages about her own country of which she is so proud, though the country she attacks so vigorously in order to lower it in the eye of the West is by far more chaste and more moral.

The Judge further gives a conservative estimate of the percentage and the nature of the outrage referred to:

" Fifteen to twenty-five per cent. of those who begin with hugging and kissing eventually 'go the limit.' This does not, in most cases, mean either promiscuity or frequency, but it happens.. I can only say," adds the Judge, " that the estimates come from high school students, and that they are the most conservative estimates I have received from that source."

Miss Mayo condemns the girl-mothers and their children in India, but these girls were lawfully wedded and their children were born of lawful wedlock, not like the innumerable illegitimate children born of unmarried mothers in their teens, away in secrecy and given in adoption, as I shall presently quote, who go to swell the ranks of the citizens of the United States of America. The

children born in India are not the frail things that Miss Mayo represents them to be, but make great poets like Tagore, saints like Gandhi, lawyers of eminence like Das and Sinha, scholars like Tilak and Arabindo, soldiers like Sivaji and Rangitsingh, scientists like Sir J. C. Bose and Sir P. C. Ray, Righis like Vivekanand and Dayananda and revolutionaries like Hardayal, men known to fame,. who stand on a par with their contemporaries in other lands in their respective spheres. Let us, however, follow what Judge Lindsey has to say about the child-mothers of the United States, the illegitimate pregnancy among the school children.

"I have at hand certain figures which indicate with certainty that for every case of sex delinquency discovered, a very large number completely escape detection. For instance, out of 493 girls of high school age, though not all of them were in high schools, who admitted to me that they had sex experiences with boys, only 25 became pregnant. This is about 5 per cent., a ratio of one in twenty. The others avoided pregnancy, some by luck, others because they had a knowledge of more or less effective contraceptive methods, a knowledge, by the way, which I find to be more common among them than is generally supposed.

"Now the point is this, first, that three-fourths of that list of nearly 500 girls came to me

of their own accord for one reason or another. Some were pregnant, some were diseased, some were remorseful, some wanted counsel, and so on. Second, the thing that always brought them to me was their acute need for help of some kind. Had they not felt that need, they would not have come. For every girl who came for help there must have been a great many, a majority, who did not come because they did not want help and therefore kept their own counsel.

"In other words, that 500, covering a period of less than two years, represented a small group drawn from all levels of society that didn't know the ropes and never came around at all. My own opinion is that for every girl who comes to me for help because she is pregnant or diseased, in need of comfort, there are many more, who do not come because they escape scot free of consequences or else because circumstances are such that they are able to meet the situation themselves. *Hundreds of instances resort to the abortionist. I don't guess this, I know it.*"

For 25 years the Judge of the Juvenile Court has been dealing with cases, sympathising with them in their distress, giving them every good advice and assistance, rescuing them from present folly and advising them as to their future and benefiting hundreds that way, both boys and girls, who later on do better as wives and as citizens. "Of course I am not libelling the

youth of America," writes the generous Judge, "I am one of its best friends; it is for this reason that I want to protect it with the truth about itself as told by itself. For 25 years I have devoted my life to my young friends and I have hundreds of them asking me to do what I am here doing."

He publishes the book not to curse but to bless, to warn the future victims, the ignorant parents, society itself, not to prove that the United States are not fit for Swaraj and should be placed under the tutelage of the more moral if dark-coloured inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

Let us not digress from the painful facts about unmarried maternity:

"During the years 1920–21 the Juvenile Courts of Denver dealt with 769 delinquent girls of high school age; *we kept a particularly close record of* those cases. They ranged in age from fourteen to seventeen years. 465 of them were no longer in school. 304 of them were."

The Judge explains that three-fourths of these girls went to him of their own accord. The only reason why the number was not larger was that it *was physically impossible for him and his staff to follow the thing up from case to case.*

"*At least* 2.000 cases were *directly involved* in the cases of those 769 girls. For one thing, the boy had to be reckoned with. In addition the two of them always had a circle of intimates,

many of whom were in on the secret and indulging in the same kind of experiences. So it goes on from one girl to other girls and from one boy to other boys, and every time I have tried to follow up the many paths that present themselves for investigation it has been like exploring the endless passages of a dark cave, whose galleries and secrets lead one beyond the limits of endurance."

Surely nothing so dreadful exists in India. In America custom and society drive the girls into appalling secrecies, but in India things are better off because the Pundits have faced the facts and solved the problem of life in reference to the climatic and other considerations. Their solution is not a counsel of perfection. It has its own serious drawbacks; but one has no right to judge from the American standpoint. In the tropical countries girls mature more quickly than in the cold countries of the North. An educated Englishwoman, a member of a Commission which enquired into the condition of young women in England, was discussing Miss Mayo's shocking observations. She deplored Miss Mayo's lack of judgment. A girl of fourteen in tropical India and a girl of twenty in England are the same in point of maturity, was her opinion.

In her stinging style, Miss Mayo says, " Ancient Hindu religious teachings are cited to prove that the marriage of the immature has not original sanction. Text is flung against text in each recurrence of the argument, Pundits radically disagree.

But against the fog evoked in their dispute stand sharp and clear the facts of daily usage. Hindu custom demands that a man have (*sic*) a legitimate son at the earliest possible moment." But the American custom produces illicit intercourse and illegitimate progeny. In the words of Judge Lindsey, " one high school girl in every ten, and ten in every hundred in our schools have their feet set on more or less perilous paths. Let me repeat that these are minimum figures and they include only the ages of fourteen, fifteen, sixteen and seventeen. They do not include the ages of eighteen, nineteen, twenty, where there is doubtless a larger percentage of such delinquency." These are concerning the actual cases of sexually delinquent girls dealt with and in the conviction of the Judge, " there are an unknown number, possibly a much larger number, who escape our attention."

The Judge adds considerately: " I have no wish to run these estimates into the ground. Even the minimum figures are shocking. I handled about a hundred cases of illegitimate pregnancy last year (1924), taking care of most of the mothers and the babies and in most cases adopting the babies out. With every one of these girls it was a touch and go whether to come to me and arrange to have the baby or to go to an abortionist and arrange not to have it.

" *And that among the girls of high school age, some in school and some out of school, in a city of*

300,000 *population!*" (The italics are Judge Lindsey's.)

Miss Mayo may say it may be so in one city or a few schools in that city. Here is Judge Lindsey's answer to it: "Such things were undeniably then going on in Denver and *they are still going on in Denver—and in every other town in the United States of America.*

"Make no mistake about it and make no mistake about the fact that Denver is no worse but, I think, a great deal better than any other city of similar size with similar social problems."

Surely there is much to depend on the opinion of a Judge to whom the law gives power to protect unborn children, whose protection the unfortunate unmarried girl-mothers seek in their thousands, whose experience ranges over a quarter of a century of intimate personal contact with thousands of cases he himself has handled, thousands of others which he knew but could not deal with, a judgment based on facts and figures and experience. Contrast with this the lack of judgment of a tourist on a population of over three hundred million, who live in villages, who have not one uniform custom or law, whose language she does not know, and in whose country she has lived for a few fleeting months.

Judge Lindsey's facts about Mother America are more appalling than Miss Mayo's half-truths about Father India!

CHAPTER IV

BOY-FATHERS

> "Meanwhile the earth increased in wickedness,
> And hasted daily to fill up her cup."
>
> ROBERT POLLOCK.

"THE beginning of the average boy's sexual commerce," says *Mother India*, "barely awaits his ability. Neither general habit nor public opinion confines that commerce to his wife or wives; he has small vitality to transmit." "Hindu customs demand that a man have (*sic*) a legitimate son to perform the proper religious ceremonies at and after the death of his father, and to crack the father's skull on the funeral pyre whereby the spirit is released. Mr. Gandhi has recorded that he lived with his wife, as such, when he was thirteen years old, and adds that if he had not, unlike his brother in similar case, left her presence for a certain period each day to go to school, he would either have fallen a prey to disease and premature death or have led thenceforth a burdensome existence. Forced up by

western influences, the subject of child marriage has been discussed of late years, and a sentiment of uneasiness concerning it is perceptibly rising in the Indian mind."

In the above passages, Miss Mayo manages to pack as many untruths and half-truths as she could conveniently manage. Let me separate the truth from the untruth and the untruth from the half-truth.

It is true that Hindu custom demands that a man must have a legitimate son to perform the proper religious ceremonies of his father, but it is untrue that the son should crack the father's skull to release the spirit. This contemptuous phrase is apparently meant to denounce the Hindu custom of cremation. Educated people in the West, however, have come to prefer cremation to burial on sanitary and hygienic grounds. Miss Mayo has only to pay a visit to the crematorium at Golders Green to realize that great Englishmen leave it in their wills that they should be cremated and memories of them are preserved in the inscriptions on its sacred walls or on slabs of marble or stone. The other day I read in *The Times* that the late lamented Lord George Hamilton—a man of much repute and culture—was cremated at Golders Green. His Lordship was perhaps more in agreement with the Conservatives in regard to Indian Swaraj, but held a different view* from Miss

* Sir Surendranath Bannerjea's speeches.

Mayo concerning Indian culture and civilization. So much for cremation, a practice which was in vogue in ancient India among the Brahmins, the Kstatriayas and the Vaishyas, who constituted the Aryan community. That it should find favour in the modern West may be a matter of deep sorrow for undeveloped minds who value the dead body of their beloved though they do not know, notwithstanding their science and civilization, the art of embalming them as the mummies of Egypt. The Indian civilization differed from the Egyptian in the care-taking of the dead. The Aryan cremated the body because when the soul had departed from its earthly bondage it ceased to be of value to him. What was precious was the immortal soul which could not be preserved by man because it was not human nor mundane. To say that the son cracks the skull to release his father's spirit argues a lack of knowledge. The person who makes that statement has obviously kept the company not of cultured minds but the " man in the street," not the man in the Hindu or Brahmin, but " Padri " Street, and not good intentioned and well-informed Padris either, but evil-minded or ill-informed ones.

The Hindu who observes cremation burns the body because he knows that it is dead ; the living spirit has gone out of it. To say, therefore, that the object of cremation was to release the spirit is to proclaim that the Hindus believe that a dead body is not dead and will be dead only when burnt.

In other words, Miss Mayo arraigns every Hindu son of burning his father alive! She does not reveal the source of her information or her authority for making her ridiculous statement of "cracking the skull" to liberate the spirit. When the body burns, the skull also cracks and the bones are reduced to ashes. According to the custom, cremation must be complete. The son's part of the cremation ceremony is briefly this: the priests take the dead body to the crematorium. Dear and near ones are the pall-bearers. The sacred *mantras* (verses) from the Vedas (Hindu Bible) are chanted. The principal priest chants, and the son repeats them. It is a prayer to God for the peace and progress of the soul that has left the body. Intelligent men and women would understand and appreciate this noble custom which has survived in India the shock of time and fate. The American woman who, in the careful phrase of the famous English Opium Eater, is "literary to the extent of having written a book," laughs at a time-honoured tradition and observance which both from a spiritual and hygienic point of view are unexceptionable.

So much for the skull-cracking fib and the ceremonies relating to the sacred dead who, surely, might have been spared the scorn of the unbeliever. Let us now turn to her libels on the living.

We are told that a child begins what the American woman calls "sexual commerce" before he is able to do so, when he has but "small vitality to

transmit." If so, one girl must be too much for him, but says Miss Mayo, he has a wife, nay wives, nay, much more, a wider range sanctioned by " public opinion," and induced by " habit." ! This remark and other similar remarks of hers are not documented. It is a sweeping generalization deduced from the personal confessions of Gandhi. Gandhi was violently sexual when young, though he remained true to his wife. He even once visited a brothel, he says, but his sense of loyalty to his wife, which the religion instils into every Hindu, saved him in time. But Gandhi's well-deserved greatness both among his own people and those outside began with his conquest of himself. Rebellious by temperament, he conquered " *Kama* " (passion) and " *Krodha* " (anger), the ape and the tiger within. Having mastered himself after years of " Tapasya," (penance)—in practice, he ventured to achieve the mastery for his own people in their own home.

" Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control, these three alone lead life to sovereign power," said an English poet. The Indian saint is a living illustration of the poet's saying. If, therefore, Miss Mayo had said the truth about Gandhi instead of a half-truth we should have had the whole truth.

Now about the wives. Hinduism permits polygamy even as Islam does. Islam restricts the Mussulman to four wives, but Hinduism is generous as the tropics in its extravagance. Judging from the generosity of his religion, the Hindu boy

prefers them "in the plural number" and finds "they do not encumber." I borrow this phrase from Byron, to embellish Miss Mayo's facts. Besides, Miss Mayo's facts are three-fourths fiction.

Whatever a religion permits is only permissive, not compulsory. Whatever a religion prohibits when observed becomes a sacrilege. It is no exaggeration to say that in the monogamous West more polygamy is practised in secret than in the open observance of the same in the polygamous East. The divorce courts bear evidence to my statement. A woman seeks divorce only when driven to it. How many of the weak mothers of the West put up with the disloyalty of the husbands either for economic considerations, because they are dependent on them, and are too unable, or unwilling to work, or for the sake of the children? This is when they know that their husbands are disloyal. What of the innumerable cases in which the husband carries on his affair on the sly? In the East men do not generally practise polygamy. It may be safely said that ninety-nine decimal nine per cent. of the educated people—educated in the western fashion—have only one wife. Ninety-five per cent. of the uneducated people have also only one wife.

About the boy-fathers of America who do not own up to their children, about these boy-husbands who in the eye of society—not God, in the eye of man-made, not god-made law—are not married, let Judge Lindsey speak :—

"The high-school boy is a much less dramatic figure than the high school girl generally. She sets the pace whatever it is to be and he dances to the piping."

The crime in the case of the Hindu boy is that he is the victimiser. In Miss Mayo's country, where liberty runs riot, the aggressor is the girl in her teens, from the eleventh age upward. American girls have a charter as wide as the wind. The boy is the straw in the wind.

Whether the boy is the victim seeker or the victim, "fully ninety per cent." of the high school boys "have had sex experience by the time they finish school," according to the conclusive evidence furnished to the Judge by the schoolboys themselves. They are not lawfully married, but secretly and frequently *in the plague-spots*, as a result of which they are terribly diseased. The testimony on this point of Judge Lindsey will be furnished later, for the present let us confine ourselves to the existence of boy-husbands.

Note the percentage! Ninety per cent from the authentic evidence of the schoolboys. "My own opinion," says the Judge, "is that fifty per cent. is a safe and conservative estimate for all classes of high school boys averaged together." This is secret "Sexual Commerce" in Miss Mayo's own Motherland as distinguished from the open matrimonial "commerce" of my own Fatherland. And what, pray, is the percentage of boy-fathers

in India? The percentage has to be taken from the census of the higher classes, Brahmins first and then Kstatriayas and Vaishyas, who all told do not form twenty per cent. of the population. Sudras constitute the overwhelming majority of India's population. Among them early marriage cannot be said to be unknown, but it is not so common as among the higher classes We have the admission of Miss Mayo herself that the villagers are not included in her sweeping statement. "A cultivator of the soil," she admits, "because of his poverty and his life of wholesome physical exertion during a part of the year, is less liable than the man of means, or the city dweller." According to her own modest estimate there are in India five lakhs of villages. Even she has not denied that India is an agricultural country. Though in her opinion India is more prosperous under British rule than ever before, even she does not deny that prosperous India is poorer than any and every western country. "Poor indeed she is," says Miss Mayo, "her huge population is mainly rural." She further admits that the majority of the people are agriculturists or cultivators. They live in the villages and not in the towns, and are not therefore affected by the vices she mocks. I admit that the lives of the educated and wealthy classes of India are not so pure as the ignorant and the poorer masses. But, in the expressive phrase of Lord Sydenham and others, the educated classes are only "a microscopic minority" of the population.

Modern education and purity do not seem to go together, whether in East or West. If you ask Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, he will tell you that the morals of the workmen of England are superior to those of the upper classes. Mr. Lloyd George, who used to be hard on the dukes in the famous "Limehouse" speeches of his less responsible days, will tell you that the middle classes are better *morally, if not better off financially*, than the aristocratic classes. A blue-blooded British aristocrat is of course proud of the traditions which are his, and will do anything to conserve and preserve the manners and morals, the genius of his race. In the democracy of America, where liberty, fraternity and equality reign supreme, all are tarred with the same brush.

"Inquiries among both girls and boys seem to show," says Judge Lindsey, "that in former years there was practically as much incontinence among boys as there is now, but that it was less apparent because then they sought prostitutes in the red-light districts. Also, that with the breaking up of those districts, they turned to girls of their class, a thing they had seldom done in the past."

I do not know how the good people of Europe will take the Judge's subsequent remark, but he says that the above tendency "gained a tremendous impetus when our young men returned from Europe after the War, inoculated with Continental standards of conduct to which they had formerly been strangers. They urged those

standards on their girl friends; it all fitted in with the hysteria for extremes which was a part of the rise of flapperism and the result we now have on our hands to make the best of. Once a nice girl would have considered such advances an insult. Now, though she may refuse, she is not likely to be offended. She is so sophisticated for that, and knows enough about the male animal to understand that his impulse is a normal one." The percentage of such nice girls is much smaller than that of the spoiled ones, as seen in the previous chapter. So much for the adoption of Continental methods, as the Judge calls it.

Miss Mayo tells the story of an Indian boy, whose father taught him how to avoid infection:

> "My father," said a certain eminent Hindu barrister, one of the best men of his province, "taught me wisely in my boyhood how to avoid infection."
>
> "Would it not have been better," I asked, "had he taught you continence?"

But here is a true story of a young man of America who learned "continence" at the feet of his father:

> "I remember," says Judge Lindsey, "being invited to dinner at the home of the Sunday school Superintendent, who was the father of one of these boys. The estimable gentleman and his wife decried 'the carelessness

of parents' to me while at the time their son, a high school boy, was suffering from a terrible case of gonorrhœa. So severe was his illness that it would frequently double him up when he was walking and this he had explained to his father as due to his having been kicked by a horse out at their ranch. The parents accepted this story without suspicion."

Miss Mayo tells the story of an Indian mystic from whose conversation she draws a damning conclusion for a nation :

> "No question of right or wrong can be involved in any aspect of such matters," a famous Hindu mystic, himself the venerated teacher of multitudes, explained to me. "I forget the act the moment I have finished it. I merely do it not to be unkind to my wife, who is less illumined than I. To do it or not to do it, signifies nothing. Such things belong only to the world of illusion."

Not much intelligence is required to know that the mystic in his own mysterious manner was pulling the leg of the tourist. There are great wonder-working mystics in India, but there are impostors also. Some of these so-called mystics, I must confess, are awful rascals. Educated in English, having lived a fast life, they take to mysticism for a change. They talk any amount of nonsense when they meet foreigners, especially tourist women ! Their one absorbing topic is sex.

Miss Mayo does not take her reader into confidence as to the probable age of the mystic, but she must know that one swallow does not make a summer. Yet she concluded from her experience of the mystic that :

> "After the rough outline just given, small surprise will meet the statement that from one end of the land to the other the average Hindu male of thirty years, provided he has means to command his pleasure, is an old man ; and that from seven to eight of every ten such males between the ages of twenty-five and thirty are impotent."

It is hardly fair to the millions of potent young men of India, and some old stalwarts married in their sixty-fifth year, who have healthy and handsome children too, to draw a hasty conclusion from a mysterious Indian mystic. Judge Lindsey tells the story not of a mystic, but a practical countryman of Miss Mayo :

> "One high school boy with whom I recently talked admitted that he had relations with fifteen girls of high school age, about half of them still in school. He had chosen them in preference to 'chippies,' or common street girls. I verified this confession, talked with practically all of these girls and found that they were good, average girls. His experience with each of them had been only one or two occasions. The

girls, with one or two exceptions, were not given to promiscuity. . . ."

This is a case of a boy being the aggressor, but the commoner feature of American life seems to be that the assault comes from the girls.

CHAPTER V

THIS PICTURE AND THAT

"That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies,
That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought with outright,
But a lie which is part a truth is a harder thing to fight."

TENNYSON.

MISS MAYO says that "Devadasis," which she translates as "prostitutes of gods," are dedicated to the temple for the use of the priests and the pilgrims. She further says that these "Devadasis" are drawn from well-to-do families and of rank and caste. Let me quote her own words:

"In some parts of the country, more particularly in the Presidency of Madras and in Orissa, a custom obtains among the Hindus whereby the parents, to persuade some favour from the gods, may vow their next born child, if it be a girl, to the gods. Or, a particularly lovely child, for one reason or another held superfluous in her natural surroundings, is presented to the temple. The little creature, accordingly, is delivered to the temple women, her predecessors

along the route, for teaching in dancing and singing. Often by the age of five, when she is considered most desirable, she becomes the priests' own prostitute.

"If she survives to later years, she serves as a dancer and singer before the shrine in the daily temple worship; and in the houses around the temple she is held always ready, at a price, for the use of the men pilgrims during their devotional sojourns in the temple precincts. She now goes beautifully attired, often loaded with the jewels of the gods, and leads an active life until her charms fade. Then, stamped with the mark of the god under whose ægis she has lived, she is turned out upon the public, with a small allowance and with the acknowledged right to a beggar's livelihood. Her parents, who may be well-to-do persons of good rank and caste, have lost no face at all by the manner of their disposal of her. Their proceeding, it is held, was entirely reputable. And she and her like form a sort of caste of their own, are called *Devadasis*, or 'prostitutes of the gods' and are a recognized essential of temple equipment."

I admit that "Devadasis" do exist in the parts of India which Miss Mayo mentions. In India, the prostitutes form a class by themselves. It is untrue to say that they belong to respectable families of rank and position. The mother of a prostitute was a prostitute once. The daughter

becomes a prostitute. Prostitutes are not drawn from families of high caste or rank.

The idea of allowing the young girls of the prostitute class to grow in the atmosphere of the temples is to instil into them some religion, some fear of God, so that when they come of age they may not indulge in promiscuity, but be the mistress of one man. The prostitutes of India are, therefore, one of the most god-fearing and loyal class of mistresses known to that unfortunate profession. Proceedings of American divorce courts bring to light terrible cases of disloyalty among married men and women. But a Devadasi who is in the keeping of one man does not go to another man so long as she is in the former's keeping. One may call it dreadful to keep a class for the unfortunate purpose, but it is equally dreadful, perhaps another may retort, to have drainage in a public city. The abolition of red-light districts in the United States have, as pointed out by Judge Lindsey, been responsible for undermining the morals of "good girls." The question is certainly controversial whether prostitution should be abolished or not. Those who advocate the abolition maintain that a girl is not lost altogether, and may mend her ways after her sex experience, and become an honourable member of society profiting by her mistakes. A prostitute is declared irremediable and irreclaimable because society has declared her to be so.

The social reformers of India are for challenging

the verdict and society. They are for remedying what has been hitherto treated as irremediable. The support of the Government was sought recently by the leader of the Opposition in the Council of State, the Hon. Ramadas Pantalu Garu, an orthodox Madras Brahmin, to abolish the class of Devadasis. He declared the institution of Devadasis immoral. The Government, however, has been following the policy laid down by Queen Victoria not to interfere in religio-social affairs. Miss Mayo says that "dire experience shows to what lengths of blood-drenched madness the people can be goaded by a whisper that their caste is threatened or that insult is offered to their gods." This may be taken as an explanation for non-declaration of prostitution as a criminal offence in India, for the non-suppression of the Devadasis. The social reformer who urges a change of system and grant of Dominion Status to India does so on the ground that a people's Government alone can have a sanction behind it to interfere in quasi-religious matters and introduce root and branch reforms. What is needed is the creation of a social authority with political powers or political authority with social powers, the recognition of which after years of unselfish work in the social and religious sphere was responsible for Mrs. Annie Besant's irruption into politics with her battle-cry for Home Rule. The social reformer is handicapped now. He cannot place in the forefront of his election programme the removal

of some of the fundamental social defects, because the legislature has no power to give effect to the pledges at the hustings, as it is only advisory, the executive not being responsible to it as it is in the self-governing dominions. The present Government, committed to the proclamation of Queen Victoria, cannot afford to play with coals of fire, as picturesquely put by Miss Mayo.

So much from the point of view of the social reformer who wants to meet the evil. The opposition of the orthodox, however, to a system which has kept society in the main clean, though a class has been treated as lost, is not without his own way of reasoning. He says that the social reformers are children of English education who aspire to Americanize India and in support of his statement may be trusted to quote Judge Lindsey's exposure of American morals. If there is a class of Devadasis in India, he says it is not half so bad as the state of things in the United States: "There are," says Judge Lindsey, "at least fifty thousand girls in New York living with men who are not their husbands, girls who should become mothers and don't care to have children because of the attitude society would take toward them."

The position of the Devadasis is exactly the same so far as "living with men who are not their husbands is concerned," but she considers it a privilege to breed healthy and good-looking children, after the birth of which she gives up her profession, and lives with the father of the child

as his mistress either in her own house which he visits or in his house. I leave it to an impartial reader to say whether the Indian picture, with Miss Mayo's colours left out, is more horrid than the picture of American life as disclosed by an experienced Judge. In my own opinion even the picture of Miss Mayo, the veracity of which I challenge, is not half so terrible as the painful truth disclosed by Judge Lindsey.

Another aspect of life which Miss Mayo has misrepresented is the early maturity of Indian girls generally at the age of fourteen, to which a passing reference has been made in a previous chapter. She gives various causes for this, that the religion is sensuous, the talks in the households, sexual, that sex symbols are worshipped as god, and serve as caste marks on the head ; half-truths all. Let us see what happens in the most properly brought up Christian families of America, where Miss Mayo's description of the Indian atmosphere and society and its attendant evils and sins cannot be dreamt of.

In his book, Judge Lindsey writes :

"We found that 265 of the 313 had come to physical maturity at 11 and 12 years, more of them maturing at 11 than 12. Dividing the 313 girls into two groups, we found that 285 of them matured at the ages of 11, 12 and 13 ; and that only 28 of them matured at 14, 15 and 16.

"The significance of this is very great. It is perfectly in line with a fact that I have constantly observed through the many years I have worked in this field, that girls who mature early are in much more danger of getting into sex trouble than those who mature later. For one thing, they are usually more attractive to boys; and, as I have already indicated, they are physiologically awake, with the desires of maturity without the intellectual restraints and sophistication of maturity. They are women with the minds of little children; and for many of them the burden and the responsibility are too much. If we educated them properly this would not often be the case; but we give them no hint of their own danger."

Early marriage is in my opinion bad. That is also the opinion of several of my educated countrymen who have been seriously and strenuously striving to remove it. But the orthodox people who stick to it, whom Miss Mayo quotes with apparent relish, say that early marriage is good not only for India but also for the United States of America to avoid unmarried maternity, illegitimate pregnancy and frequent escapades harming the reputation of good families.

Miss Mayo writes virtuously against the attitude of the Legislative Assembly to a piece of legislation regarding the suppression of obscene publications which its members were not prepared to

pass without an amendment (*Indian Penal Code*, Act No. VIII of 1925, Section 292) :

> " It is true to conform to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications signed in Geneva on September 12, 1923, the Indian Legislature duly amended the Indian Penal Code and Code of Criminal Procedure ; and that this amendment duly prescribes set penalties for whoever sells, lets to hire, distributes, publicly exhibits . . . conveys . . . or receives profit from any obscene object, book, representation or, figure. But its enactment, unqualified, although welcome to the Muhammadans, would have wrought havoc with the religious belongings, the ancient traditions and customs and the priestly prerogatives dear to the Hindu majority. Therefore the Indian Legislature, preponderantly Hindu, saddled the amendment with an exception which reads :
>
> " This section does not extend to any book, pamphlet, writing, drawing or painting kept or used bona fide for religious purposes or any representation sculptured, engraved, painted, or otherwise represented on or in any temple or on any car used for the conveyance of idols, or kept or used for any religious purpose."

Miss Mayo's conclusion, it would seem, is Indian religion is obscene, Indian sculptures and paintings are obscene, the whole Indian life is obscene,

"demonstrating every conceivable aspect and humour of sex contact."

In the passage above quoted Miss Mayo does a grave injustice to Diwan Chammallal, one of the most brilliant members of the Legislative Assembly, to whose power of oratory Sir Frederick Whyte, its first speaker, gave a rich tribute on a historic occasion, who wanted an even wider scope so as to include books dealing with life and literature, and thus voiced the opinion of a large section of cultured people in the country. The religious toadies and flunkeys were content with an amendment, but some of the people in the country do not believe in censorship of legislations; their vicious vision, of course, Miss Mayo would explain. Let us hear Judge Lindsey's opinion on the subject.

"Censorship of this and that is one means of safeguarding the public from the dangerous and contaminating truth, which is very much in the newspapers just now. It ranges from a censorship of school histories that tell the truth about the American Revolution to the suppression of books that try, in dramatic terms, to tell the truth about sex.

"There are books written for purposes evidently corrupt. And yet, why should such despicable trash be able to corrupt anybody?

"Education in the young in the whole subject of sex would sweep most of this evil out of

existence; there would be no need for censorship of anything because an enlightened public opinion would be its own censor by virtue of its genuine preferences and its educated tastes. Instead, we try to cure one evil of ignorance and concealment with another. It can't be done.

"There is also a class of books that deal with subjects conventionally forbidden, but whose value to society is undeniable. They are not intended for immature minds; but there should be other methods than censorship of protecting such minds against them. The destruction and suppression of such sources of truth for such reasons involves the payment by society of too high a price for any advantages that it may gain.

"There is hardly an ancient classic that could have survived the present censorship laws. Shakespeare would never have been heard of after the *Rape of Lucrece* and *Venus and Adonis*."

I saw a remarkable picture of the Rape of Lucrece in the Potsdam Palace drawn, as the guide informed me, by a world-famous artist. It was an admirable work of art.

On the walls of the Potsdam and Berlin Palaces of the Kaisers-that-were hang various religious sculptures and paintings, the envy of academies all the world over, the rarest of their kind. Some of these pictures have Biblical importance; other

pictures of Greek and other mythologic interest; of nude goddesses and angels; of the apple of discord and so on, so forth. The Palaces where the Kaisers ruled are thrown open to the public by the German Socialist Government even as the Museum and the Zoo. Surely it did not occur to me that the Germans were a vicious people and that the visitors from all parts of the world, the majority of them German-Americans, who admire them, must be of perverted taste. I admired the pictures and felt as though I was a guest of the Kaisers, whose pictures were looking on me from the galleries as I passed from room to room, from hall to hall of the magnificent palaces of "barbaric pearl and gold."

Referring to the young widows of India, Miss Mayo cites as her authority Mahatma Gandhi and Lala Lajpat Rai—the latter a veteran social reformer who lived in America for about ten years—and hints at the atmosphere of sexual stimulus in which they lived their youth. One cannot form any accurate conclusion from the quotations which are deliberately torn out of their contexts. Mahatma Gandhi has repudiated her statements, quotations and deductions.

Be that as it may, it is untrue to say that the Hindu widows are a "source of corruption and dangerous infection to society." It would be criminal madness, blasphemy of the basest type, to say that the nuns are "dangerous" and "corrupt" as a class in the United States because

there might have been cases of some of them going wrong. The atmosphere which surrounds the Hindu widow is, in essentials, the same as the one in which a nun in the West lives. There are advocates of the maintenance as well as of the abolition of the same institutions in both countries.

Judge Lindsey gives statistics of marriage and divorce in his own country. The figures are remarkable reading. The Middle-West city of Denver showed for the year 1922 one separation for every marriage. For every two marriage licences issued a petition for divorce was filed. Denver, said the Judge, was no worse than any other big city in the country. The ratio of divorce to marriage had risen by leaps and bounds. Five years ago, it was one to four; now two to four. The actual figures in Denver for 1922 up to 16th December were 1,492 divorce cases filed against 2,908 marriages. The divorces were, therefore, 49.5 of the marriages.

Here are some statistics of marriage and divorce for the year 1924.

Atlanta, Ga. ...	Marriages	3,350
	Divorces	1,845
Los Angeles ...	Marriages	16,605
	Divorces	7,882
Kansas City ...	Marriages	4,821
	Divorces	2,400
State of Ohio	Marriages	53,300
	Divorces	11,885
Denver ...	Marriages (approx.) ...	3,000
	Divorces filed	1,500

When one sees that Miss Mayo's fiction about India is not so bewildering as Judge Lindsey's facts about America, he naturally asks, "Why beholdest thou, then, the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?" Plutarch says: "The poets feign concerning Lamia that upon her going to bed she lays aside her eyes among the attirements of her dressing box and is at home for the most part blind and drowsy too, and puts on her eyes only when she goes abroad a-gadding. So it is with most men, who, through a kind of affected ignorance and artificial blindness, commonly blunder and stumble at their own threshold, are the greatest strangers to their own defects and of all others least familiarly acquainted with their own domestic ills and follies."

CHAPTER VI

WOMEN AND PURDAH

"You have already gone too far
When people once are in the wrong,
Each line they add is much too long,
Who fastest walks, but walks astray
Is only farthest from his way."

MATTHEW PRIOR.

THE American tourist came to curse and not to bless. She laughs at the women and yells at the men. She tries to discredit the whole lot of them by impressing on her western readers that all Indian women are enslaved and imprisoned behind the Purdah walls. After quoting primitive books, she describes the stupidity and injustice of the "Purdah" in which Indian ladies live. The Purdah is certainly an indefensible thing. Nobody can say that it does not exist in the Orient; but to say that those who live in Purdah are worse than slaves would be untrue. Women are still the queens of the household, and exercise from behind the Purdah as great an influence as women in the West. Further, all Indian women do not

live in Purdah. Any one who reads *Mother India* will think that this awful custom obtains throughout the land. But what are the facts? Purdah prevails more in the towns than the villages, and more among the Muslims than the Hindus in the upper half of India which is divided by the Vindhya mountains. In the Indian peninsula, Purdah is unknown among the Hindus. In Malabar the women have more rights than even the women of the West. They inherit property there and not the men. The system which prevails there is matriarchal—not patriarchal. The amount of liberty enjoyed by the Malayalee women is such as to make their western sisters envious. The women are all the more restrained, all the better and all the more beautiful for it. But the alarmist Miss Mayo says that if an Indian woman were to go to the villages, she would be sure to be a victim of rape! The men are Satans in human form! How did she arrive at this conclusion? She met a few very young girl students, too young to form an idea of men and things, and asked them if they would go to the villages as teachers. The young ones who had lived in the towns all their lives and knew no more about the villages than that they were invested with vampires and ghosts, naturally exclaimed, "Help! Help! We dare not go there." How dare they, says the tourist, they will all be raped. "Indian women of child-bearing age cannot safely venture, without special protection, within reach of Indian men!" Yet

hundreds and thousands of Indian women work in the fields and the mines. They go to the jungles to cut wood and gather grass. Among the upper classes, women are not wanting who go to their farms, alone and unattended, and look after their management. In places where there is scarcity of water, women go to distant streams or wells and fetch water, alone. Men in the East are no greater ruffians or gentlemen than men in the West. If an Indian tourist collects a dozen cases of rape committed on young girls of Chicago or New York or San Francisco, will he have established an unchallengable case against the morals of the men of the United States? If what Miss Mayo says is true, that the men in India are dangerous characters whose religion is rape, there would have been no space in the Indian jails for millions. The men and women of India, young and old, make a point of taking sea-baths, river-baths or baths in the public tanks every day. There is no Hindu who does not rinse his mouth every morning before breakfast and does not take his daily bath. An Oriental who witnesses men and women, boys and girls, taking sea-baths in Brighton or Ostend is reminded of similar scenes in India, only the colour of the bathers is different. What of the fairs and festivals in which ancient India still lives and of which women are the ornaments?

No civilized man will deny that Purdah is a curse. It came to India with the Muslim régime. If it still lingers in Upper India, the fault does not

wholly rest with the people. Education alone can illumine the darkness of Purdah. The money that ought to go for the education of the girls and boys of India is spent on a foreign army of occupation, leaving very little for the education and amelioration of the condition of the slum-dwellers and the uplift of the nation as a whole. To quote Mr. H. M. Hyndman:

> " Out of the total revenue raised in British India, that is to say, India directly under British rule, we spend only one penny per head on education and only one per cent. of the population goes to school. The improvement during the last ten years has been nominal. Yet even in Russia, a very poor, backward country, the expenditure on education is 7½d. per head and the children at school number between four per cent. and five per cent. of the whole population."

But, says the American authoress, Indians are unwilling to pay for the education. Not unwilling, but unable. When one remembers the average income of the Indian, one is amazed at the charges laid at Mother India's door. " Lord Curzon," says Mr. Hyndman, " did not estimate the average income of the Indians at more than two pounds a year." According to another English estimate,* twelve shillings and sixpence per head is the average value of the production of the peasants

**Prosperous British India.* By William Digby.

and cultivators. Miss Mayo, however, attributes the low percentage of education, not to lack of funds, but to the lack of teachers. This assertion,* like other assertions of hers, is not borne out by facts. Thousands of educated men belonging to the middle classes are turned out every year by the Universities who only swell the number of the unemployed. This unemployment among the educated middle classes is becoming a serious problem. † It is adding fuel to the fire of political discontent.

In the absence of education, especially of expensive educational facilities in the interior, it is no wonder that India is submerged in Cimmerian ignorance. Her men and women in the villages live in the middle ages, nay, in the distant past where the lights of history refuse to penetrate. Have not a hundred and fifty years of British rule improved the state of things? No greater condemnation of that rule has ever been made more unconsciously and foolishly than in *Mother India*. "What have the British been doing in the last hundred years that my village should be like this?" asked an Indian of the American tourist. This gentleman, be it noted, is not an agitator, but a loyal friend of the Government, and has risen to the highest position open to an Indian.

Miss Mayo delights to dwell on the awkwardness of the manners of the Indian women and makes

* *The Awakening of Asia.* By H. M. Hyndman. Cassell & Co., Ltd.

† Assembly Debates 1926–27.

fun of one of her hosts at a Purdah party. She makes the mistake of viewing things Indian through American glasses. If one wants to understand the life and manners of a wholly different people living for ages under a different civilization, he must exercise some charity of judgment. A monk asked an abbot " how is it that the divine spirit never allows me to be charitable ? " To which the abbot, with righteous indignation, said : " Don't say the divine spirit ; say I don't want to be charitable." That is the spirit in which the American writer has approached her subject.

CHAPTER VII

INDIAN WOMEN—THE REAL FACTS

> " Aspersion is the babbler's trade
> To listen is to lend him aid."
>
> JOHNSON.

MISS MAYO gives a gruesome picture of the goat sacrifice to the goddess of Kali in Bengal and then proceeds to make the worst form of aspersion I have ever read on Hindu womanhood :

" The blood gushes forth on the pavement and the gongs before the goddess burst out wildly. . . . Meantime, and instantly a woman who waited behind the killers of the goat has rushed forward and fallen on all fours to lap up the blood with her tongue, in the hope of having a child. . . . The devotees of Kali ghat will include Hindus of all classes and conditions."

The Lord Mayor of Calcutta, Mr. Sen Gupta, Barrister-at-Law, at a public meeting refuted this reprehensible statement. The goat sacrifice is true, said he, but that women lick the blood like dogs is wholly untrue. As for the goat sacrifice in

India, where religion permeates every department of life, the kitchen not excluded, whenever an animal is killed, it is treated as a sacrifice and prayers are offered to God. In America, the animal is killed without the prayer. I know a Brahmin Maharaja who ate meat thrice a week, but before he ate it, he saw to it that the animal was "sacrificed" with a prayer for the progress of its soul. According to the Hindu religion, the animals too have got a soul, and hence the sacrifices by meat eaters to reconcile the killing of the animal with the demands of conscience and religion. India, let it be remembered, is the only country in the world where millions of people abstain from meat.

Miss Mayo's description of the sacrifices at Kali ghat, with which she opens her book, is revolting reading. The sacrifice of the poor goat is bad enough. It is not approved by the Hindus of the higher classes who, as she herself admits, are followers of Vishnu. But to speak of a woman, "stooping, laps at the blood with a cloth and thrusts the cloth into her bosom," so that the Kali might give her a child, would seem to show that the imaginary battle against feminine sterility is fought in the crudest style in the blood-stained ghats of Bengal! "Naturally Miss Mayo does not mention," says Mrs. Annie Besant, in the *Theosophist*, "perhaps she did not know, that masses of the worshippers of Kali never take part in any blood-sacrifice, and that while such sacrifices go on under British rule, the Indian Woman-

Regent of Travancore abolished them in the State she rules. Similarly, when an attempt was made in the Indian Council to raise the age of consent (before the reforms of 1919) it was frustrated by the British Government. That has been the obstacle to reform, as it was the obstacle to free and compulsory education. That has only been passed, over nearly the whole of India, by the reformed Legislatures. We must look to Indians for the abolition of blood-sacrifices. So long as foreign meat-eaters rule and have their ghastly slaughter-houses, how can we expect them to legislate against these cruelties of the Left-Hand Path?

"The book becomes more and more slanderous as it proceeds. The writer seems to have merely sought for filth. Does she imagine that if her presentation were an accurate picture of Hindu civilisation that Hinduism could have produced a civilisation in India dating from the sinking of the Island of Poseidonus, some nine thousand years before the Christian era? It would have been smothered in its own putrefaction. But India has a future even greater than her marvellous past."

Mrs. Besant is opposed to the animal sacrifices. The philosophy of her life is that of higher Hinduism which finds expression in the Lake Poet, whose verses I quote from memory.

"The being that is in the earth and air
In the green leaves among the groves
Maintains a deep and reverential care
For the unoffending creatures whom He loves."

Protesting against the goat sacrifices generally and Miss Mayo's revolting description of the same, and condemnation of the Hindus of all classes as taking part in it, which is not in consonance with facts, Mrs. Besant says: "I would no more submit to that outrage than I would sing in a Christian church of being 'washed in the blood of the Lamb.'"

Speaking about the treatment accorded to the Hindu widows, Miss Mayo quotes the book of a Miss Cornelia Sorabji. Judging from the name, the writer seems to be a Parsi and a Christian, but if she followed the wise policy laid down by Queen Victoria for all foreigners in India, and those who do not profess one and the same religion, she would have attended to her own business instead of circulating cock and bull stories. Miss Mayo herself, if she wanted to know the life of the Hindu widows, should have gone not to a Parsee-Christian, but a few good Hindu homes. After quoting from the book,* which has long ago been discredited in India, as the vapourings of an unbalanced and uninstructed mind, Miss Mayo draws the following conclusions about the Hindu widows:

> "From the moment of her husband's decease till the last hour of her own life she must expiate her own sins in shame, suffering and self-immolation, chained in every thought to the service of

* *Between the Twilights.*

> his soul. Be she a child of three or be she a wife in fact having lived with her husband, her life is the same. By his death she is revealed as a creature of innate guilt and evil portent. Miss Sorabji thus treats the subject, ' the widow becomes the menial of every person in the cause of her late husband.' "

Miss Mayo says, " they can be easily denied, but they cannot be disproved or shaken." Surely a child-widow of three having lived with her husband can both be denied and disproved; particularly as Miss Mayo does not document her own statement in regard to the baby of three having a husband and living with him. Even Miss Sorabji is not quoted in support of this " fable," which ought to find a place in *Grimm's Fairy Tales*. Let us imagine an American " granny " at the fireside getting up a story of the baby-wife and baby-widow and baby-husband of three and four in " the land of Gandhi and of tigers," which according to the tourist we are criticizing is the American conception of Mother India. Contrast with Miss Mayo's conclusions and her quotations from the book of a non-Hindu woman, who knows as little of the lives lived by the orthodox Hindu families as the American tourist herself, the observations of a competent authority who says:

> " In respectable families widowed daughters and sisters are the pets of the household, and receive more kind treatment than daughters-

in-law, who, being strangers from another family, are regarded with suspicion until they become mothers. The statement, however, that widows are ill-treated because they cannot marry is as reasonable as to say that maidens in Europe are ill-treated because they cannot find husbands. Married life has its troubles as much as unmarried existence, and woman may, like men, be happy and useful, whether married or single, if they receive from infancy proper education and opportunities of service to their fellows." *

Thus it will be seen that Hindu widows are treated with the utmost consideration in India until they are married again. The strict prohibition of widow re-marriage exists only among the exclusive community of Brahmins, which is only a small fraction of the Indian population. But from time immemorial until to-day, widow re-marriages have been going on in the other communities. There have, of course, been cases of widows who have chosen for the rest of their lives not to re-marry out of reverence to their husband, or for the sake of the children.

Among the depressed classes, widow re-marriage is as common as it is in America. Among the Sudras widow re-marriage is as common as in Europe. Among the higher classes of Kstatriyas and Vaishyas, it is not uncommon. Among the

* *A Study in Ideals. Great Britain and India,* by M. C. Mullick.

educated Brahmins it is confined at present to the virgin widows, which is due to the religious reform movement of the Aryas, the social reform movement of the Brahmos and the independent activities of Hindu social reform associations. A man like Mr. K. Natarjan, who is one of the sanest journalists in India, editor of *The Indian Social Reformer*, has exclusively devoted his attention for the last forty years to social reform, and he counts among his followers educated members of the Brahmin community all over India—men of the standing of the Right Honourable Sastri, India's Ambassador in South Africa to-day. The achievements of the social reform leagues of Natarjan and the Servants of India Society of Shastri in this direction have not been admitted by Miss Mayo.

In orthodox Brahmin families where widows are not married, the treatment accorded to them is as good as the treatment meted out to the old maids of America. Says the Census Report for 1911, "the number of genuine spinsters over twenty is exceedingly small and an old maid is the rarest of phenomena." In the *Census of India* we find the number of spinsters not given, because "it is safe to say," says the census report, "that after the age of seventeen or eighteen no females are unmarried who are not prostitutes or persons suffering from bodily affliction." If the atmosphere of India is poisoned in the opinion of Miss Mayo with the breath of the

widows, it will not be unsafe to retort that the breath of America is polluted with the poison of unmarried mothers or maids.

For her misrepresentation of the treatment of Indian women and the place assigned to them in society, the American writer, who could have at least been a little generous to *her own sex*, seeks authority not in what she saw so much as in what she read. The Abbé Dubois is quoted frequently, though this visitor formed his conclusions after going to one or two Presidencies. This book was not taken much notice of in India, because he was not "boosted" by the American, or, for that matter, by the English press.

According to Miss Mayo, women lead a wretched, miserable life in Purdah, with no interest in life or society, much less in politics. Contrast with what she makes out the observations of an Englishman: *

> "Perhaps the most influential person I have met in the Punjab was a lady who has been now for many years the Headmistress of an Arya Samaj girls' school. The Arya Samaj schools aim at fostering Nationalism. They are open to criticism from some points of view, but even their critics recognize that they are genuine educational institutions, very different from the

* *Indian Politics.* By J. T. Gwynn. With an Introduction by Lord Meston.

political mushrooms which Non-co-operation called into existence.

"The headmistress herself was a politician, as shrewd and sane a politician as I have met in India, but a pretty strong Nationalist. She told me that since she had taken charge of the school she had seen to it that no girl left it without receiving a thorough grounding in Nationalism. She admitted that till 1919 most of the girls probably lost interest in politics after leaving school. But since 1919 that has changed, she thinks.

"The Arya Samaj has girls' schools scattered all over the Punjab, and this school supplies the teachers. That will make a difference presently. But as yet there is not much sign of women's political activities. Indian newspapers are inclined to exaggerate the part which they play. The men are anxious to bring them into the field and some day they will come, but to-day they are not there in any force. In Gujerat I met two lady politicians, but they were in politics because their fathers, husbands or brothers were politicians. I believe it is quite true that all the women of India worship Mr. Gandhi, but they are interested in him as a saint, not as a politician. In Bardoli, I did see one thing that impressed me. We had been sitting in a Brahmin house hearing the villagers' views on Swaraj. I noticed a widow woman hanging about, evidently listening with all ears. Before

leaving I asked if we might have her views. She refused to talk, but she picked out the man who had used the strongest language and said, 'I agree with what he says.'

"But the women of Gujerat seemed to be much less ready to wear *khaddar* than the men. In the Punjab the women folk of the educated classes are, I think, a bit ahead of their sisters in Gujerat. In one town I have seen them wearing *khaddar*, quite a number of them. In other places I have heard they make it very unpleasant for the wives of Indian officials when an active agitation is in progress. The European mistress of a Gujerat girls' school told me that there had been a lamentable change in the atmosphere of the school. Her pupils who used to be so friendly had now grown hostile or suspicious.

"This much 'progress' has been achieved, but apparently some years must elapse before Indian Nationalism can mobilise the full forces of the women even in the towns.

"Good information which I got later makes me think that I have here rather under-estimated the interest which Indian women already take in politics, especially in the towns. The Sikh women are said to be in the van of progress in this direction. As elsewhere, the women who are in politics are usually decidedly more bitter and uncompromising than the men."

CHAPTER VIII

ERRORS AND EXAGGERATIONS

> " Thus men go wrong with an ingenious skill,
> Bend the straight rule to their own crooked will;
> And with a clear and shining lamp supplied
> First put it out, then take it for a guide."
>
> WILLIAM COWPER.

To comprehend fully the fantastic nature of Miss Mayo's generalizations, an Englishman has to picture to himself an orthodox Oriental, vain " Purdah-miss," full of racial pride, convinced of the superiority of her national culture, customs and manners, visiting the gay, fast West. Imagine that she reads the sensational news in a certain section of the popular press and rushes to the insane conclusion that the English are a race of rakes, thieves, robbers, and murderers ! She then goes to the theatre, witnesses one of London's frankest plays, " The Fanatics," which exposes the defects of the present marriage system, and deplores " the incredible amount of disease in the streets." She visits one or two hospitals and asks one or two

doctors there about the condition and character of their patients and concludes that the entire race is unclean and immoral, infected with all unmentionable diseases. She goes to a picture palace; the American films shock her; she suspects the Yankees have no morals or manners. She reads the proceedings of the criminal courts of the United States; her suspicions are confirmed. She notes in her diary: " Yankees are liars, thieves, homicidal maniacs; full of cowardice and corruption, sexual debauchery; sub-human vices; degeneracy; untruthfulness." She is taken by a friend to a dancing saloon. Not having seen a western dance all her life, accustomed to speak to men only from a respectable distance, bowing to them and never shaking hands, the visitor from the East is horrified beyond words to see men and women, not husbands and wives, clinging together in public, making simultaneous movements of their bodies in harmony with the music. In the East dancing is only for the professionals—the " deva dasis " (nautch angels). These professionals dance not with men but alone, singly, by themselves. The Oriental traveller comes to wrong and hasty conclusions which are confirmed by her visits to the night clubs. She has seen things with her own eyes, heard things with her own ears and thinks that her competence to write a book cannot be challenged! She proclaims from the house-tops: " The entire West is immoral, sensuous, diseased and false. It is a danger to the culture and

civilization of the East. Social boycott and an observance of stricter exclusiveness than in the past are the only way."

Even as Miss Mayo reads some sexual symbols in the caste-marks on the foreheads of the Hindus, her Oriental imitator comes to funny conclusions from the short skirts, the bare arms, the open necks. In India women wear copious garments. The Saree of one Indian girl has material enough for the dresses of four American girls.

When I was coming to England by the P. & O. boat the "Rawalpindi," a poetry-competition was on. An European fellow-passenger who won the prize had for his subject high winds and short skirts. A young Indian who was coming to the West for the first time whispered to another, "What a taste!" The other, an old traveller, wisely replied, "Each nation has its own standard. The standard of the one is not the standard of the other. But each is good in its own place." The world would be dull as ditch-water if oppressive monotony, boring sameness, prevailed throughout.

Street-accosting is a common feature of the European cities. There are in India brothels, but not street-walkers. Because some thousands of unfortunates walk in the streets and live by the wages of prostitution, a whole nation cannot be denounced as immoral. Because a great majority of them is venereally infected, it will not do to say that all men and women are so infected. If you were to take a census of the venereally infected

persons in the hospitals of America and India and compare it with the population of the respective countries, you would find that India is not so bad as she is painted. In South India there is a common belief that the countrymen of Vasco da Gama, the first visitors to the East, were the importers of syphilis. The phrase "Paranghipun" in Tamil and Malayalam shows that this is a disease of "Paranghis," or Europeans. There is no other word for it in the language. As Indians live in remote villages, they fortunately live in their pristine purity. Even though the condition of the cities is not satisfactory it is not so appalling as the condition of the American towns, where venereal infection is unspeakably extensive and intensive. In France, it may be less, because the brothels are in charge of the Government and doctors visit the unfortunates and examine them and certify as to their cleanliness. In the United States, where the unfortunates are not in the "happy" position of compulsory medical attendance, the poisonous infection is incurably enormous. The number of venereal hospitals and specialists in America testifies to the terrific prevalence of the disease. They would not be increasing in numbers, but dwindling only to disappear, if the disease were not in the ascendancy. Notwithstanding all this, it will not do for an Oriental to say that every American is either crooked or deformed, that every Western woman is venereally infected because there happen to be several cases

in the hospitals. But this is exactly what Miss Mayo does. She says that venereal disease is universal in India and she holds that responsible not only for the terrorist movement in Bengal, but also for the innumerable deaths of infants and babies. As well could she put down the deaths due to plague and influenza to venereal infection !

Thousands of infants die every year. What are the causes of the shocking infant mortality ? India is poor ; poverty and procreation go together. The greater the poverty, the greater the numerical strength of the poor man's family " Forty millions of people," said Gokhale,* " according to one great Anglo-Indian authority, Sir William Hunter, pass through life with one meal a day. According to another authority, Sir Charles Elliott, seventy millions of people in India do not know what it is to have their hunger fully satisfied, even once in the whole course of the year." Mr. Montagu said : " Does anybody in this audience realize that last year, in the great influenza epidemic, no less than six million people died in India ? . . . Has not the exceptional mortality in India something to do with poverty and the consequent lack of resisting power ? "†

So long as poverty remains as it is, the children born of ill-fed parents without vitality are bound to perish for want of vitality and food. It is well

*Gokhale's Speeches 1905.

† Mr. Montagu's Speeches, March 7, 1919.

they perish. If they live, they will only live to suffer and accumulate the ever-increasing distress of a distressed people.

India is admittedly the poorest country in the world, yet she has no poor houses provided by the Government. The rich people have built "dharmasalas," large rest houses, all over the country, of which no word is mentioned by Miss Mayo. In southern India free food used also to be, and still is, if on a lesser scale, provided in the "dharmasalas" for three days only to every poor wanderer who stays there. Be it noted, this has been provided by the charity of some rich man, and not by any officials or missionaries. Yet we are told there is no charity in India! If there were charity, argues the tourist, how could there be a class called "untouchables"? This is just like saying, if there were nobility in Europe, how could there be hosts of street-walkers? If there were philanthropy, how could there be slums? The denizens of the slums are certainly treated as worse than "untouchables."

Miss Mayo was the recipient of much attention from some well-to-do people in London for her unique exposure of India's pretensions to culture and spirituality, superior to those of the West. Did she then remember the slum children? When she went to dine with Lady So-and-so in the West End, did she care to invite her suffering, untouchable sister in the East End? Ah, yes, the lady may say, the latter had not been invited. But then

there was nothing to prevent her whose heart melts for the untouchables to invite her suffering sister of the East End and her prospering brother of the West End to her place, say in London, W.C. or E.C. She quotes the Indian scripture to say that the untouchables have been condemned to a life of ignorance. She forgets that Rama, one of the Hindu Avatars or incarnations of God, whom millions worship, was the guest of a *chandala* or untouchable woman. Rama was a Kshabriya, a caste next in superiority of birth and rank to the Brahmins. He was the Crown Prince of Ayodhya and after the death of Dasharadha became the Emperor of Hind. But, Miss Mayo may say, that was in the dim dawn of history. The answer to this is, in the memory of many of those living, Ramakrishna Paramahamsa, the Guru of Swami Vivekananda, who won world-fame at the American Parliament of Religions, swept the house of an untouchable with his long, flowing hair! Ramakrishna was a Brahmin of Brahmins—orthodox and pious. He is adored by the millions of India generally and of Bengal in particular. But this, the woman will say, is a solitary instance. The great Arya Samaj missionary and preacher, Swami Shraddhanand, who was shot last year by a Muslim fanatic for his successful missionary propaganda reclaiming the untouchables and Muslims to Hinduism, not only preached but practised what he preached. He dined with the untouchables of Malabar, where unapproachability

prevailed in its worst form. Hundreds of his followers do the same. A campaign was started in a pilgrim centre, the village of Vaikam, in Travancore, a citadel of orthodoxy, where the untouchables were prevailed on by the high-class Hindu reformers to adopt passive resistance. They were prohibited from immemorial times from frequenting certain roads. This prohibition had the sanction of time-honoured tradition and practice and the support of the Indian Government of the Travancore State. Nothing daunted, the reformers offered battle. Orthodoxy was up in arms. The Brahmin-assisted Nair engineered untouchables, picketed the Brahmins' temple gates after entering the prohibited roads. They were marched to the prison, where they were treated as gentlemen, well fed and well clad. Fresh batches of men took their place. The battle continued for months. The Government of the Maharani (Queen) of Travancore, herself a Kshatria, married to a Brahmin—intermarriage being an ancient custom of Malabar—was the first to respect the reformers' wish. Orthodoxy was defeated. A new precedent was established. That is how the war against superstitions and primitive priestcraft is carried on by the Brahmin reformers themselves. It is not the alien missionary or the Salvation Army that leads or inspires this politico-religious struggle. It is the much-maligned Indian agitator who works in the faith that reform must come from within.

Miss Mayo says that " A Nair (high caste Hindu)

meeting a puliah (untouchable) was entitled to stab the offender on the spot." The Nairs are the Kshatria or the warrior class of Malabar. If they had been stabbing the puliah (untouchable), we should not have had an ever-increasing population of untouchables. If the Nair does not indulge in the luxury of stabbing, it will be said, it is because of the British rule and British laws. If the Nair had carried on his alleged vocation of stabbing the puliah, the entire tribe of untouchables would have been exterminated years ago. We all know the fate of the Astroloids—now anxiously preserved as a zoological curiosity. We also know how the Red Indians were lynched off the face of the earth by Miss Mayo's barbarous progenitors. Notwithstanding her wild statements against the Hindus, they have not acted like brutes towards brother-men. They have built churches for the Christians, Mosques for the Mahommedans and home and hearth for the Parsees, who fled from the tyranny of Persia.

If one reads between the lines of Miss Mayo's book one would find that the objection of the Hindu is not to the untouchables themselves, but to their uncleanliness. They are accepted as the "hope of India," says Miss Mayo, inadvertently, after their education and elevation by the Christian missions. According to her estimate, about five million untouchables have been converted to Christianity, which means an overwhelming majority of the Indian Christians who have been condemned to

poverty, ignorance, and squalor, have been rescued by the good missionary. All honour to the Christian missionaries for their noble work, all honour to the organizations which have financed the missionaries. It is patent from Miss Mayo's own statements that the objection of the Hindu is the same as the objection of the aristocrat of the West in regard to the "submerged Tenth." Is the aristocrat wrong in not stooping down to their level? Are the middle classes wrong in not changing their comfortable houses for the slums? The Hindus of India believe in the abolition of the slum; in the education and uplift of the poor to whom education is a luxury, in uplifting them and not degrading themselves.

CHAPTER IX

"EARTHLY GODS"

"He who can stand within that holy door
With soul unbowed by that pure spirit-level
And frame unequal laws for rich and poor
Might sit for Hell and represent the Devil."

THOMAS HOOD.

THE claim of the Aryas, conquerors of ancient India, was that they sat for Heaven and represented the God. The divine law-makers, in the words of Miss Mayo, " devising the caste system, placed themselves at the head thereof under the title of 'earthly gods'—Brahmins." All rulers and invaders take up that attitude, however wrong it may be. The ancient Brahmins were certainly wrong in "posing" as "earthly gods." The indigenous inhabitants betrayed generations unborn, when they accepted the superiority of the Brahmin, and for themselves a position of inferiority, even as the forefathers of the present generation of Indian Nationalists were guilty of betrayal of the Fatherland in acquiescing in the British over-

lordship. The Aryan invaded India in the prehistoric age, and if he believed in his divine right to govern wrong, he did not pretend to be a democrat. He was better than the white Brahmins of the twentieth century, who also lay claim to that divine right at home and abroad. The great socialist party which commands the future of British public life is a protest against that grotesque claim to what Mr. H. G. Wells called "Hohenzollern" divinity over their own people, while the Indian National Congress is an invincible challenge to that super-Brahminic pose in the East. The Ilbert Bill of Lord Ripon outraged this pose, and had to be withdrawn because of the protest of the "earthly gods" of the nineteenth century. Testimony to this fact is borne out in a contemporary and characteristic utterance:

> "The cherished conviction was shared by every Englishman in India, from the highest to the lowest, by the planter's assistant in his lowly bungalow and by the editor in the full light of the presidency town—from these to the Chief Commissioner in charge of an important province and to the Viceroy on his throne—the conviction in every man that he belongs to a race *whom God has destined to govern and subdue*." * (The italics are mine.)

* Speech delivered by Mr. W. S. Seton Kerr, member of the Bengal Civil Service and Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, at a meeting in St. James Hall, London, protesting against Ilbert Bill.

Miss Mayo quotes the *Bhagavata*, a religious book relating to the age of mythology, which treats the murder of a Brahmin thus :

> "Whoever is guilty of it will be condemned at his death to take the form of one of those insects which feed on filth. Being re-born long afterwards a pariah (untouchable), he will belong to this caste and will be blind for more than four times as many years as there are hairs on the body of a cow. He can, nevertheless, expiate his crime by feeding forty thousand Brahmins."

Brahmin as I am, I am not an admirer of Brahminic laws and rules, both ancient and modern. In my own opinion, Brahminism was laid low by the Mahommedan conquest. The last vestige of it was removed under British rule. But the Brahmins and Kshatrias carried on their administration in India, not with whips and scorpions, but living a higher life, a superior pose—in one phrase, spiritual prestige.

The Brahmins had to live a higher and nobler life, because theirs was a social conquest of a primitive Indian people who were much larger than the newcomers in number and savage in the ways of life. To conquer a savage, one must either be a greater savage or a saint. Discretion being the better part of valour, the Aryans took to a saintly way of life and became the spiritual leaders of the original natives of India. The modern Brahmins, however, have established a

political conquest which can be preserved only by force.

Whatever the evils of the caste system in the Pauranic age (age of mythology or Purans), the books of which period Miss Mayo consults to get to " the root of things," the " varnas " (castes), as introduced in a prior period, the Vedic age, was really an original and useful method of distributing labour.

The Aryans divided themselves into three castes. The Brahmins, the Kshatrias and the Vaishyas. They absorbed the aboriginal ruling and middle class in a fourth caste called the Sudras. In the lowest deep there was a lower deep; the Sudras of the slums, who were too uncivilized, too unclean. They were called " the fifth caste," or " the Panchamas "—condemned to live in their own slums, their own lives and not contaminate other castes. They were given up as irreclaimable.

The Brahmins looked after the administrative side. They were ministers and public servants, corresponding to the Europeans in superior civil services in India. The Kshatrias were the warrior class who joined the army, became soldiers, generals and kings. The training given to the Brahmins in the study of the Vedas, medical, political and literary, differed from the training given to the Kshatrias, even as the teaching in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge differs from that of Woolwich and Sandhurst. The

Brahmins lived in a world of their own. The Kshatrias lived in their own atmosphere, even as the civilians and soldiers have their own different clubs and think differently of each other. The Vaishyas were the commercial people, who may be compared to the European trading classes, forming the non-officials among the ruling caste. The Sudras were the subordinate class and servants of the Aryan invaders.

Quotations are cited from the Puranas to show that the Brahmins were intolerant, that the Sudras were looked down upon and so on and so forth. The caste system which had come into existence in the Vedic period, which according to the Hindu religious text dates to somewhere near 15000 B.C., but according to the calculations of historians 5000 B.C., was certainly a wonderful arrangement. There was interdining as well as inter-marriage among the higher castes. There was no intermarriage between the Aryan and the non-Aryan castes, even as there are no intermarriages now between the European official class in India and the Indian classes.

The caste system of the Vedic period breathes pure love for the original people. The Scriptures uttered no curses and claimed no superiority. The ancient Aryans set class against class and when the warring elements, both victor and vanquished, had become weak and weary, they quietly brought both of them under their yoke. It was only when the yoke was firmly established on the necks of

the people that the period of Aryan Imperialism, "rattling the sabre," began. This was the Pauranic period, the age of Puranas, which diluted the democratic spirit of the Vedas. The labour organization of the Vedic age had clearly deteriorated. Caste system had brought in its train caste prejudice. Vedic democracy had yielded place to Pauranic imperialism, which was the road to ruinous wars. Ramayana, the famous Hindu epic, records the war in Lanka between Rama, the Emperor of India, and Ravana, the King of South India (Ceylon). A thousand years after another big war broke out between Kauravas and Pandavas, which is recorded in the Mahabharata. Then came the age of Buddhism, which preached socialism and non-violence, the abolition of all castes and creeds and of the exploitation of the godhead to serve the purpose of man. Buddhism reigned supreme for long years. Kings and Emperors embraced the new religion, which attained to its highest popularity during the reign of Emperor Asoka. Brahminism was revived under Sankara. Bhuddhism, which had spread over the land, was assailed with the characteristic unscrupulousness of religious fanatics, so much so that the non-violent Bhuddists had to leave India in large numbers and the religion itself was banished from the country only to spread over Tibet and China. India itself became the scene of internal wars and external invasions like contemporary Europe.

It is absurd to compare India to any single

western country, because India is a continent. The difficulty that the Nationalist meets in the way of organization of the Indian forces is inevitable, as is the task of organizing a continent. The absurdities to which Miss Mayo has been led by her generalization are because of her inability to understand that she was not dealing with one people but different peoples. Even though more closely-knit, the marriages and other customs and languages of Englishmen, the Welsh and Scotsmen differ. In Scotland itself the Lowlander and the Highlander speak different dialects. Great Britain is not one nation, but a combination of several. Yet some kind of nationhood was achieved through bloody wars. The same nationhood was being attained in India when the English appeared on the scene, dealt with the situation with remarkable cleverness, and introduced into India a new governing caste

Miss Mayo omits to tackle the question of the white " outcastes." These were the products, whether legitimate or otherwise, of the early English rulers who had not the colour prejudice of the latter-day Imperialists. They did not bring with them their wives. The distance between England and India was longer then, as the Isthmus of the Suez had not been pierced. It is said that the Eurasians have the vices of the Indian and the Englishman and the virtues of none. This is untrue. There are energetic and intelligent people among Eurasians. But they have not been able

to give up the idea that there is a dash of the blood of the rulers in their veins. When they give up this notion and begin to look upon India as their Fatherland, they will have more opportunities of becoming useful citizens of the State.

Miss Mayo has not attributed a single virtue to the Brahmins, who are the devils incarnate. Not by threats and curses have they retained their position of social superiority, but by their plain living and high thinking through shining scores of centuries. Whatever the faults and failings of Brahminism, the community has evolved an ideal life for itself at least in one direction. South of the Vindhya mountains, in the entire Indian peninsula, the Brahmins neither eat meat nor drink wine. While meat is eaten by the Brahmins of Upper India and fish by the Bengalee Brahmin, drink is universally forbidden in north and south alike. There is no parliamentary act of prohibition in India. Has Miss Mayo put to herself the question how the Brahmins have remained a community of strict teetotallers? South India abounds in birds, lambs and deer, and the finest fish that the rivers supply. Imagine, then, the leaders of society, a race of aristocrats and intellectuals, eschewing animal food and wine! These things they have left for the original inhabitants, the sons of the soil from time immemorial.

Brahmins had successfully enforced prohibition in their own society from millennium to millennium

by rousing public opinion. In Miss Mayo's own country, which is of yesterday's growth, with no ancient culture to call its own, Parliament has to enforce the law. In the country which she maligns and misrepresents, society has achieved what law has failed to enforce in her own native land.

CHAPTER X

PEASANTS AND UNTOUCHABLES

"Misery we have known each other,
Like a sister and a brother
Living in the same lone home
Many years—we must live some
Hours or ages yet to come."

SHELLEY.

HARROWING accounts of the plight of the British slum-dwellers are given from time to time by reformers and politicians. But the condition of these unhappy people is any day better than that of the peasants—leave alone the untouchables—of India whose "mansion," in the words of a sympathetic Englishman,* who has been in India and seen it, "is a mud hut with a roof of sticks and palm leaves. His bedstead, if he has one, consists of twisted sticks, which raise his mattress, if he has one, six inches from the ground. He has no door or windows to his hut. He has a little fireplace and cooking place outside. The

* *Happy India.* By Arnold Lupton.

sofa upon which he can recline in leisure moments is made of mud outside his sleeping chamber. He has one garment round his loins and he has no other garment that he can wear whilst he is washing that one garment. He neither smokes nor drinks nor reads the newspaper; he goes to no entertainments. His religion teaches humility and contentment, and so he lives contentedly until starvation lays him on his back." Such is the misery of the Indian farmer who forms a majority of the population in one of the vastest and poorest of agricultural countries in the world. The Indian farmer would deserve that dreadful fate if he were a waster and an idler, but he is one of the most thrifty and painstaking members of the human family.

The same writer says: "Yet the Indian labourer works very hard, and he and his family give minute and particular care, working often from morn till dark; yet the produce per acre is not more than one-half of the British produce per acre. When one considers that out of this half he has to pay rent, he has to pay a salt tax and some other taxes, it is not surprising that his economic condition is extremely bad; the only wonder is that he can exist at all; and he exists simply because he has learnt to live in an exceedingly cheap manner." The English writer further asks: "What would be the condition of the British farmer and the British labourer if for all their labour they only got one-half of their produce per acre?"

England is heaven for farmers and labourers alike when compared to the condition of things in India. The Government cannot be criticised too severely for their neglect of the farmers and the labourers. Criticism and creating of public opinion, the rousing of mass consciousness, is rewarded by change of government in England, but in India the publicists who do similar work are bound over for good behaviour, or arrested for promoting race-hatred or creating disaffection among the masses. In the stereotyped language of the man-on-the-spot, they are " prejudicial to public safety." Without healthy criticism, neither the people nor the Government can improve. Criticism by the opposition is invariably unsavoury to the party in power in a self-governing country. In a country which is not free, criticism is sometimes criminal. If, however, the Government had taken up the cause of the masses and promoted their welfare, the critics and the agitators would find no audience in followers. They cannot set a prairie on fire in the absence of inflammable material to feed on. When they roused the peasants of the United Provinces, the Government visited the ringleaders with imprisonment and the districts where excitement prevailed with the Seditious Meetings Act, thus putting down all propaganda. The Government have had more time to preserve peace and order than to utilize their resources and men of science for the regeneration of the land. This is the opinion not

only of the Indian agitators, but also of impartial Englishmen like Mr. Arnold Lupton, who went to India not with the idea of writing a book, preaching hatred against Indians and lowering them in the eyes of the white people of the world, but to see for himself whether any country could be so much impoverished and helpless and ruined as the Indian agitators were fond of saying. Mr. Lupton travelled from north to south and east to west. He had introductions to the Governor-General and the three Presidency Governors. He met the European civil servants as well as the Indian gentlemen. He went to the villages and farms, talked to the farmers and labourers, inspected their dwellings, formed an impartial judgment and wrote to stimulate the people and the Government alike. He was not an American propagandist, but a good Englishman and good Englishmen do not flatter the Government in their own country, as those who know them know. In the opinion of Mr. Lupton, if men of science had guided the destinies of India there would have been abundance for the poorest classes.

Says Mr. Lupton in his *Happy India:*

" The subject which I have tried to study and on which I desire to write is the simple economic problem, India's wealth and India's poverty, India's health and India's diseases. I consider it is disgraceful to the British Empire that there should be any large body of its citizens

who are continually hungry. I do not think that the Government can be blamed for occasional famines. When the monsoon fails the crops fail, and there must be great hardship and shortage of food, and I do not say that occasionally hardships are necessarily a great evil to a great people, but if I am told that fifty millions of the subjects of the Emperor of India never have a full meal from the 1st January to the 31st December, that when they have an occasional feast, as at the marriage of a daughter or a son, that feast is paid for with borrowed money, which leaves the father in debt for the rest of his life, then I think that something is wrong in the State, and that the first effort of any ruler should be to see if it is possible to improve the economic position of the people so that under average conditions of climate the people shall be well fed, well clothed and well housed, and live in sanitary conditions which give them the enjoyment of good health. These are the first conditions of national welfare.

"'If I were the Governor-General of India, I should not bother about Tibet or the Pamirs of the North-West, neither should I trouble the Ameer of Afghanistan nor feel the least bit anxious about Persia, but I should try first of all to see if the resources of the British Empire would enable me to proclaim to the world that I had raised the economic condition of the people of India to one which might claim com-

parison with the other great peoples of the world. But the Governors of India have come from a class which knows no hardship, which has not got to consider the wages of the husbandmen or the amount of food necessary to keep a working man and his family in good health. Their minds for the most part run on military achievement, upon spectacular receptions and sporting expeditions. If, on the other hand, we were to send out a Governor-General from our own working classes or some engineer accustomed to deal with them, one of the first things he would enquire into would be the economic condition of the working classes, and he would naturally give his time and attention to considering how to ameliorate that condition where such amelioration was obviously necessary.

"It is said that the Emperor Augustus boasted that he had found Rome a city of bricks and left it a city of marble, so a modern aristocratic Governor-General of India might boast that he found the new city of Delhi a city of ruins and that he left it a magnificent city of palaces. But the working-man Governor-General would be more likely to boast that when he went to India he found the wages of the poorest cultivator of the soil were about 4d. a day, and when he left he had raised those wages 1s. a day, whilst the price of the necessities of life remained at the same level as when the wages were lower. That indeed would be a glorious boast and one

which I think is quite possible of fulfilment if the British nation would take any kindly and generous interest in the great Indian Empire.

" Never before in the history of the world has a country containing three hundred and nineteen million civilized people with ancient and glorious histories going back thousands of years been subjected to the control of a nation of forty-seven millions, living at a distance of seven thousand miles. It is obviously the solemn duty of the British nation to give its instant and serious attention to this great matter and to insist that the honour and glory and dignity of the British nation shall not be smudged because a certain Government department desires to be left alone in the government of our dependency."

Contrast with the above observations the impressions of Miss Mayo. She went to a fair and saw some peasants buying shoes and cigarettes. Why should they wear shoes or smoke cigarettes, she argued, if they were really poor? She could as well have gone to the Madras Presidency and seen the wealthiest people walking without shoes and call their bare feet a symbol of poverty! "At a fair in Aligarh, in February 1926," she says, " the turnover in cheap boots in one week amounted to one thousand pounds, netting a profit of twenty per cent."

Not only must cigarettes and matches be proof of prosperity, but also railway traffic! " The heavy third-class passenger traffic is another

evidence of money in hand." Before the railways came into existence, was there no travel? One hundred thousand boatmen found their occupation gone in Behar and the United Provinces when railways were opened. If a Miss Mayo of the pre-railway era had stood on the banks of the Ganges or the Jumna and watched the crowded boats that studded the river, what would she have said?

Contrast with Miss Mayo's glowing description of the bazaars selling cheap foreign cigarettes and umbrellas, the state of things in India as disclosed by tourists and travellers of another time. In the middle of the eighteenth century, Phillimore wrote that "the droppings of her (India's) soil fed distant nations." Tavernier, another traveller, speaks of "Kasembazar," a village in the kingdom of Bengal, which "exported yearly 22,000 bales of silk, weighing 2,200,000 pounds at 16 oz. a pound."

"It was this enormous wealth," says Mrs. Besant,* "that drew Europeans to come hither to shake the pagoda tree." The stories carried back by successful shakers drew others to the golden land.

Miss Mayo's picture of the wretched life in which millions of untouchables still live is terrible:

> "Regarded as if sub-human the tasks held basest are reserved for them; dishonour is associated with their name. Some are permitted to serve only as scavengers and removers of night soil. Some, through the ignorance to

---

* *How India Wrought Her Freedom.* By Mrs. Annie Besant.

which they are condemned, are loathsome in their habits, and to all of them the privilege of any sort of teaching is sternly denied."

This is dreadful slavery. Why have the countrymen of Wilberforce tolerated it? Less than a hundred years ago the American planters did not like the ministry of Lord Grey (1834) for its enthusiasm for the abolition of slavery. The historian says *:

"Though the slave trade had long been prohibited, yet slavery itself still subsisted, and the West Indian planters were a body strong and wealthy enough to offer a vigorous opposition to the enfranchisement of the negroes. Many of the old Tories were narrow and misguided enough to lend them aid in Parliament, but the bill was carried."

Supposing the bill was not carried, would self-government have been denied to England from that unhappy day? Were the old Tories disenfranchised and disqualified for supporting slavery? Because untouchables exist in India, we are told India is not fit for self-government! The Montagu reforms were a mistake; the Indians are a nation of barbarians; their only saviours are the English civilian and the American missionary.

It does not occur to our reviler to argue the other way. India has been under the British rule

* *The History of England.* By Sir Charles Oman.

for one hundred and fifty years. No such steps have been taken to abolish untouchability, which is a form of slavery in India. Had it been considered advisable, would not those responsible for the administration have legislated to abolish untouchability ?

The best way to raise the position of the untouchables is to give them the right to vote. The orthodox caste man in the legislatures will have to dance attendance on the very class from which he has been kept at a respectable distance ; he will have to keep his constituents in a good humour.

We have seen above what a sympathetic Englishman has to say on the condition of the peasants. The untouchables are certainly much worse off. They have no houses to live in ; they either live under the trees, or in the pits and holes dug in the earth like rabbits, or in thatched hovels with low mud walls, called " cheruma chalas " in Malabar, which neither protect them from rain or sun or storm. These poor people have no good food to eat. They feed on the filth and offal thrown by the upper classes ; on rats, frogs, snakes and other reptiles. Innumerable untouchables are decrepit and deformed, aged and invalid. If Miss Mayo were a friend of these untouchables, why did she not make a passionate appeal to the Government to hold out a hand to these helpless, God-forsaken people ?

The British Government was not seriously troubled by Councils and agitators until twenty

years ago. There was no Brahmin legislator to deny justice to the untouchables. The American authoress would ask humanity to believe that for all the troubles of the untouchables rotting in the slums and the diseased animals rotting in the streets, the greedy Brahmin agitator in the council who cares only for himself and not for God's dumb creatures is wholly responsible. What have the Government been doing for more than a century, before the era of reforms and councils? Did the Government give unto the untouchables of India what they had given to their own invalids and paupers? Miss Mayo would say that it is all an affair of the public. But it has been the conception of the British that it is the duty of the Government to do what individuals, however public-spirited, have failed to perform. "All attempts to cope with pauperism by voluntary charity having failed," says the English historian, * "it was finally resolved to make the maintenance of the aged and invalid poor a statutory burden on the parishes. The new law provided that the able-bodied vagrant should be forced to work and if he refused should be imprisoned, but that the impotent and deserving should be fed and housed by overseers who were authorized to levy rates on the parish for their support."

We read no similar attempt on the part of the Government of India, whether for the touchables

* Oman's *History of England*.

or untouchables, amongst both of whom are a large number of the aged and invalid poor.

The poor relief of England was once as high as £8,000,000. Owing to the new Poor Law of 1834, the total cost of poor relief fell down from £8,000,000 to £4,700,000. Why did not the Government inaugurate an untouchables relief in India? Let Miss Mayo answer.

CHAPTER XI

SLAVE MENTALITY

"Let falsehood be a stranger to thy lips;
Shame on the policy that first began
To tamper with the heart, to hide its thoughts,
And doubly shame on that inglorious tongue
That sold its honesty and told a lie."

WILLIAM HAVARD.

IN her anxiety to establish India's unfitness for Swaraj or self-government, Miss Mayo indulges in statements, not only about the Indian nation, but its women and children, which only reveal the depth of her ignorance. She says that Indian mothers teach to, and practice on, their sons and daughters immoral indulgences; that good-looking boys are dedicated to the unnatural pleasures of grown men. Let me recall her own words:

"In many parts of the country, north and south, the little boy, his mind so prepared, is likely, if physically attractive, to be drafted for the satisfaction of grown men, or to be regularly attached to a temple, in the capacity of a

prostitute, Neither parent, as a rule, sees any harm in this, but is rather flattered that the son has been found pleasing. This also is a matter neither of rank nor of special ignorance. In fact, so far are they from seeing good and evil as we see good and evil, that a mother, high caste or low caste, will practise upon her children, the girl, 'to make her sleep well'; the boy, 'to make him manly,' an abuse which the boy, at least, is apt to continue daily for the rest of his life."

To one of the cleanest races on the face of the earth, where religion teaches that innocent boys and girls are the manifestations of God, such practice is unthinkable blasphemy. Indian women are the custodians of the culture ot the race, the embodiment of the best feminine virtues, as daughters, wives and mothers. It may be that in some parts of India the man, in his conception of sex superiority, has assigned to the woman, so far as public life is concerned, no equal place. It may be in some other parts of India, they have been living in "Purdah." It may be that, in the lives that they daily live among certain classes, there is more approximation to the lives lived by the earliest men and women as described by Milton * :

"For contemplation he and valour formed,
For softness she and sweet attractive grace :
He for God only; she for God in him."

* *Paradise Lost.*

A corresponding passage can be cited from Manu : *

> "Duteous girl obeys her father,
> Husband sways the duteous wife,
> Son controls the widowed mother;
> Never free is woman's life."

Call this conception ancient, unchivalrous, barbarous, if you please. One is entitled to his opinion and has a right to make his comment. A conservative is equally entitled to say that there are and ought to be differences between man and woman, alike in regard to the life that she should live, the manner in which she should live it and the part she has to play in it. Opinions will differ to the end of time on the vexed question of the equality of the sexes. Miss Mayo is certainly entitled, as is every sane person, to say what she thinks of Purdah. But she has no business to make assertions about people whom she does not know, whose habits she has not studied. The only information she has collected about them seems to be from the lowest of minds, the social lepers amongst whom she must have moved, whom she appears to admire and whose stories to her she seeks to immortalize as gospel.

Less monstrous than her attack on the women of India—whose morals compare favourably with those of the women of any part of the world—are her statements in regard to the Hindu god Siva; less monstrous, I say, because Siva, the god of the Universe, dwelling on the Kailas mountains,

*_History of Ancient India._ By R. C. Dutt.

as depicted in the Puranas, sits too high to be reached by a casual American visitor.

"Siva, one of the greatest of the Hindu deities," says Miss Mayo, "is represented on high roads, shrines, in the temples, on the little altar of the home or in personal amulets, by the image of the male generative organ, in which shape he reviews the daily sacrifices of the devout."

I am a Brahmin of Brahmins. I have done Puja (worship) to Siva and performed Abisheek (pouring of holy water on the image) in the days of my youth in the orthodox home in which I lived. But before doing the Puja, I had to go and bathe in the river every morning and perform my Sandya (prayer). These rituals—call them superstitions if you like—I have left behind me years ago. But all those days of worship, I did not know that Siva represented, as He did to Miss Mayo, the male generative organ. The first time I knew it was on reading Miss Mayo's *Mother India.* Presumably that was an interpretation of some ill-informed Padri. The Padri himself might have heard it from the lips of some anti-Sivaites or iconoclasts who went to any extent to denounce idol-worship and used any amount of wild vituperation to run down their opponents. The controversy was maddening, as all religious controversies are in East or West. Have not slanders been uttered by sacrilegious people about the birth of the divine Christ and Virgin Mary?

Siva represents to the Hindu mind, one of the

"Thri-Murthis" (Trinity), the other two being Brahma, the Creator, and Vishnu, the Protector. Siva is known as the "destroyer." Surely the vulgar description of Siva-Puga which Miss Mayo gives does not tally with the function allotted in the scriptures to Siva, the destroyer and not the creator. To the Hindu mind, Siva represents the highest spiritual revelation, destruction of egoism, of pride and of possession. The one story that I had heard in the days of my youth may be mentioned: Viswanath, as Siva is called (Lord of the Universe), or Kailasnath (Lord of the mountains), relinquished his lordship, went and sat in the *Smashan*, or cremation ground, smearing over his body the ashes of the many dead, and thus he humiliated himself. Did not Christ say, "Blessed are the humble"? The story further runs that Siva used a skull as a bowl with which he begged. Imagine the King of the Universe so humiliating himself! This was only a mythological way of impressing on the child-mind the ephemeral vanities of human existence and the hollow unrealities of rank and wealth. Has not every schoolboy in the West read the extraordinary stories in the Greek and other mythologies about Jupiter and Mars, Minerva and Venus, sirens and Circe, the last of whom used to tempt seafarers, whom she metamorphosed into swine by the merest touch of her rod?

The American writer goes on to say that "the followers of Vishnu, multitudinous in the South,

from their childhood wear painted upon their foreheads the sign of the function of generation.

"Fanciful interpretations of this symbol," she adds in a footnote, "are sometimes given"; yes, by her companions, the missionaries. To the Hindu, however, it is a caste-mark, a part of his daily ritual to show that he has taken his morning bath and done the morning prayer. Against this extravagant Hindu ritualism reformers arose, the Rishi Dayananda Saraswathi in the Punjab, who founded the Arya Samaj, and Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Keshab Chandra Sen, who were the founders of the Brahmo Samaj Movement in Bengal.

Dayananda Saraswathi was the Martin Luther of India. His teachings, which millions of followers accept and observe in their lives, rejected all the Pauranic accretions, and asked the people to go back to the religion of the Vedas. The Arya Samajists recognize no caste or creed. They live amongst the depressed classes, and work for their improvement, both moral and material. They have got rid of the curse of early marriage. They educate the girls who have given up Purdah in their thousands. Their schools and colleges are not supported by the Government but by the public. The Samaj send out missionaries in their hundreds. Bold spirits, splendid workers, they go among the people preaching and teaching in open daylight the need for reform and regeneration on Vedic lines. Their social reform propaganda was once (now no longer) viewed with

hostility by a Government which read in every social upheaval a political danger. Dayananda Saraswathi brushed aside all unmeaning superstitions. The Arya Samajists neither worship idols nor wear caste-marks. They are true followers of the Vedas, whose greatness and glory have been brought to light and life; as a result the activities of missionary propagandists, both Christian and Muslim, have received a setback. The American tourist could not be unaware of the work of the Arya Samajists. Yet she does not notice their great work and increasing popularity. She quotes as her authority some Hindu books which are special pleadings of interested Pandits of a thousand years ago, omits to quote the authoritative texts of an earlier period, and also misses a comparative recent book, which is the Bible of every Hindu to-day, educated and uneducated, denizens of town and residents of villages.*

Like the Arya Hindus of the Punjab, Rajputana and the United Provinces, which in size and population are double those of the British Isles, the Brahmo movement has wrought a great social revolution in Bengal. The evil of early marriage, on which Miss Mayo dwells with all the frenzy of a Padri, and all the hyperbole of a writer of historical fiction, is fast disappearing in Bengal. The agitation to make widow-marriage legal has

* *Satyarth Prakash*. By Rishi Dayananda.

borne rich fruit, and a government, which was reluctant to help the social reformer, had to yield to his pressure and support the passing of some necessary legislations in the matter. It is quite a common thing to see hundreds of unmarried women of culture of eighteen or nineteen years of age in Bengal, the United Provinces and the Punjab. Interdining has become a matter of daily life among the educated classes.

Social reform, however, is slow of foot from the ambitious reformer's point of view. Recently it has been overshadowed by political agitation. But this, however deplorable, is inevitable. " Great constructive movements have to wait until the destructive movement has succeeded," say the Swarajists. It may seem a tragedy, but it is a sure sign that the reawakened people are anxious to come into their own. The ideal thing will be to make social and political reform march *pari passu*, but in national struggles the ideal method is often replaced by the lower but more effective one. " Even for purposes of social reform, it is necessary to have a government of the people," says the Swarajist. " An alien government's chief work is to keep up its prestige. The only shield of that prestige is the superstition of the people. The Anglo-Indian Government, therefore, should not be blamed for their inability to lead the social reform movement or even to assist it materially."

The movement of social reform would not have much headway in England but for the fact that

she is a self-governing country. Leader after leader came to the fore with the cry of reform on his lips. Elections were fought on live social issues. One party vied with another in its zeal for the progress of the people. The suffering people supported one party at one time. When they found that it failed to fulfil the pledges given at the hustings, they transferred their support to another party. It is self-government and the party system of Parliament which have made modern England what she is. In England, the old parties recently degenerated with the pursuit and possession of power. The Socialist Party, therefore, came into existence with talks of far-reaching schemes of social reform. A discontented Empire has yet to be strengthened by removing the causes of discontent. A demoralized and poverty-stricken people have yet to be rescued from the deepening abyss of demoralization and poverty at home and abroad.

" When the evil of concentrating power in unimaginative parties who are more fit to make wars and preparations for wars is becoming clear to the thinking men of England," says the Swarajist orator, " not much imagination is required to conceive of the danger of having a handful of exiles in continued and uncontrolled power over three hundred odd millions of people in a foreign and far-off land. If Hindu enthusiasm for social reform has recently slackened, it is because his zeal for political freedom has increased. He

has decided to fight the bigger of the two issues."

"What India wants to-day is power, without which there can be neither national progress nor social happiness."

Miss Mayo quotes from the speeches of some notorious reactionaries in the Legislative Assembly,* who opposed the unofficial Bill of 1925 raising the girl's marriageable age of consent. But if she had some sympathy for the struggling reformers, if the ghastly propagandist motive to cry down the Indian people had not possessed her, she would have read in the brave fight of a very large number of the social reformers in the Assembly the hope and promise of a new India. I can speak with better authority than the American tourist of this debate, as I took part in it. My own view was not to discuss that measure there, in the presence of people who were sitting comfortably on the official benches. The officials were indifferent to a debate which, be it noted, would have brought about the dissolution of India's Parliament, so close was the voting. The reactionaries who opposed the Bill and the progressives who introduced it and supported it, would have appealed to the country for its mandate, had India the same system of Government as England.

* Legislative Assembly Debates, March 23, 1925.

CHAPTER XII

RIOTS, POLITICAL AND COMMUNAL

"What boots the oft-repeated tale of strife,
The feast of vultures and the waste of life."

BYRON.

A VERITABLE war is on, it would seem to one who reads Miss Mayo's book carelessly. To a careful reader, however, it would appear that though communal feelings run high and occasional eruptions do take place, the atmosphere on the whole is tranquil. The lava of Communalism, Miss Mayo would say, is thrown out by the Vesuvius of reforms.

Miss Mayo writes:

"In 1909, however, the wind switched to a stormy quarter. The Minto-Morley Scheme was enacted by Parliament as the 'Indian Councils Act.' The effect of this measure was instantly to alarm the Muhammadan element, rousing it into self-consciousness as a distinct and separate body, unorganized, but suspicious, militant in

> spirit and disturbed about its rights. For saw clearly enough that in any elected legislature, and in any advantages thereby to be gained, the Hindu was practically sure to shoulder the Muhammadan out of the path."

The Morley-Minto reforms did not affect the masses one way or another. The electorate was too narrow, the powers of the Legislatures were too limited. Realizing this, the Muslim and the Hindu started a constitutional agitation for more reforms. The All-Indian Muslim League and the Indian National Congress presented to the Montague Commission, a joint-demand for self-government within the British Empire.

The Muslim League was the organ of the politically and communally-minded Mohammedans of India. If the Morley reforms had alarmed the Mohammedans, they would not have joined hands with the Hindus to produce a joint-scheme.

The value of this Hindu-Muslim unity was admitted in the Montford Report and the importance of the joint-scheme fully recognized, though the scheme itself was riddled with masterly criticism and mercilessly rejected :

> "Then came 1919," says Miss Mayo, "the extension of the reforms of 1909, the transfer of much power, place and patronage from British into Indian hands and the promise furthermore of the reviewal of the field at the end of a third ten-year interval with an eye to still further

transfers. From that moment except in country districts unreached by the agitators peace between the two elements became a mere name —an artificial appearance maintained wholly by the British presence. And now, as 1929, draws nigh, the tension daily increases, while the two rivals pace around each other in circles, hackles up, looking for first foothold."

The communal situation has no doubt much to do with the Montford Reforms. The foundation of the reforms is radically wrong. It is not political but communal. Under the Montagu reforms, Indians have no doubt an electorate wider by far than that which they possessed under the Morley reforms. The mischief, however, lay in making the electorate communal and separate, instead of having a united and joint one as in England. The Jews were not enfranchised a century ago, but when franchise was extended to them by an Act of Parliament, they were not given separate representation. Britain's treatment of the Jews could have been extended to the hitherto unenfranchised Hindus and Muslims. I must frankly admit that the responsibility for misleading Mr. Montagu lay entirely with the politicians of the National Congress and the Muslim League. When he rejected the Congress League scheme, it was a pity that he chose to accept the evil in it, namely, separate representation. The reforms were only an experiment. The

purpose of the Statutory Commission of 1929 is to correct the mistakes of the past. Wise men, English and Indian, Hindu and Muslim, have come to the conclusion that the communal tension has much to do with the communal electorate. The idealists say, "bury the communal electorates in the bowels of the earth, reforms or no reforms." Practical-minded politicians, better known as Moderates, urge: "Go on with the reforms, make the electorates joint, and placate the communalists by giving them separate representation through the joint electorate." According to the practical politician, the existing arrangement should be scrapped, so far as the electoral system is concerned, and seats for the communal minorities fixed in an extended joint electorate. In his opinion, for a joint electorate to be a success, it must bring within its range masses of Hindu and Muslim villagers, who have not been enfranchised.

Under the present arrangement, the Mohammedans are to go to a separate polling booth and vote only for a Mohammedan; similarly the Hindus. As a result of this, the Hindu has to pose as a better Hindu and the Mohammedan a better Muslim from the communal point of view. The best Muslim and the best Hindu is, of course, the most orthodox and the most extreme. The reforms, which are essentially political, have thus a religious and communal foundation. Miss Mayo paraphrases the ideas of Sir Michael O'Dwyer and the *Morning Post*, who have been never tired of

saying most justly indeed that the reforms are responsible for the riots on a scale unknown in the pre-Montagu period. They are, in a sense, right. The masses who have been enfranchised are kept in communal compartments. The candidates at the elections have been compelled to preach communalism to their constituents and show to their credit work of a communal character during their term of the Legislature.

A sample of the interpellations may be presented :

> " Will the Government be pleased to state how many Muslims are there, in proportion to their numerical strength of the population, among the Inspectors of Police ?
>
> " Will the Government be pleased to state why a Hindu post-master has been superseded by a Mohammedan ? "

and so on and so forth.

A specimen speech of a Hindu candidate at the election may be given. Brahmin as he was, a Swarajist was opposed during the last election to the Legislative Assembly by a Hindu candidate on the ground that the former was not a good Hindu, that he dined with Mohammedans and wined with Europeans ! The Swarajist retorted by saying that he was a better Hindu than his critic because his religion was not the kitchen and his God was not the cooking pot, and he had the sanction of the Vedas to fight untouchability. But the point is—

the Swarajist had to meet the Hindu argument from a higher Hindu standpoint.

The candidate who seeks election to the Legislature is out to win it by hook or crook, so long as he is not guilty of any corrupt practice; even if he is guilty, so long as the guilt cannot be proved by his opponent. He can safely follow the bad old motto: "Everything is fair in love and war." Election is both love and war, love for those who spend their own money, time and energy to see their favourite wins. War for the contending parties, who go for each other in a merciless and unscrupulous style. The immediate object is victory, and to that all ethical considerations, principles and policies must be callously subordinated.

When the election temperature rises, the better type of Hindu candidate set up by the Hindu Sabha, the organ of the Hindu communalists, stands up, and "holds forth" in the right orthodox, if ridiculous, style:

"Brothers, a serious crisis has arisen in the history of our lives. Riots have become as common as influenza and cholera. The British Raj has neither chosen to prevent nor succeeded in preventing the occurrence of riots. And in times of riots and peace, the Sirkar favours the Mussulman because the latter is willing to co-operate. The Sirkar treats them mercifully, because the Muslim pretends to be loyal. At heart he might be the most disloyal wretch. But so long as the

Hindu Congressmen have non-co-operation and obstruction for their creed, the Muslim politician would play the fool with the Government. The Muslims are better politicians than the Hindus. What we want is to beat the Muslim in his own game of slavish co-operation. And there is Mother Cow, who is not protected by the English, whose slaughter in numbers is not prohibited because we carry less weight with the English, the best of our men having turned non-co-operators. The first object of the true Hindu candidate, on his return to the Legislature, is to offer co-operation to the Government with a view to protect the Cow."

The above is the higher standard of communal appeal, which is meant to touch the half-educated as well as the ignorant electors. There is also a lower kind of appeal. Here it is :

> " In the name of the Cow and the Ganges and all that is holy in Hinduism, do not vote for a Swarajist who wants Swaraj by surrendering to the Muslims ; who does not believe in Shuddhi (conversion to Hinduism) and Sangatan (organisation of Hindu Communalism) ; who does not counteract the Muslim missionary activities converting thousands of Hindus to the Muslim fold ; who is useless for Hindu purposes in the Legislature, because he is incapable of thinking communally and acting religiously "
> —and so on and so forth.

A highly-strung Muslim candidate makes a similar appeal:

> Addressing his workers or a huge crowd in the park, he says: "We must be grateful to Allah, who presides over the destinies of the coming elections. Every Mohammedan worth his salt will vote for me, because you know, brothers of Islam, that in the Councils I put hundreds of questions in regard to the employment of Muslims in the services in preference to the Hindus." (A voice: "What became of them?") "Well, whatever consideration the Government have shown to the Muslims is because of my agitation. Remember there is the Muslim University, for which I would secure more money from the Government than the astute Pundit of Prayag manages to get for the Hindu University."

Then came seething curses on the Hindu. The candidate knows that his electors are wholly Muslim and therefore the stronger the appeal for the resurrection of Islam in the services, the better the chance of his being returned. And if his rival candidate happens to be a Nationalist, woe betide him. A prominent Mohammedan leader was opposed on the ground that he drank whisky and soda in the company of a Kafir, a Hindu. Not that drinking whisky is prohibited by Islam so much as good whisky should be polluted by bad Hinduism. The same leader was also attacked on

another ground, that he was a better Hindu than Muslim for matters political, and a better Englishman than a Muslim for affairs social.

The Legislatures are political and not communal bodies. They exist for constitutional and legislative purposes. Take the work of the Legislative Assembly, also called "India's Parliament" ever since it came into existence. The proceedings in the main are of political, constitutional, economical and commercial, but not communal character. A political debate might have been given a communal turn with an eye for the forthcoming General Election. Communal interpellations are no doubt indulged in by some members who want to make sure of their return.

The one solid thing that the Reform Act has conceded is an electorate. And the best purpose to which an election campaign can be put, involving as it does an enormous expenditure, is useful propaganda. What would have been an useful educative election campaign, however, has been rendered unprofitable, nay, harmful, by the introduction of the vicious principle of a separate and communal electorate, because a communal outlook, a communal programme and inflaming of communal passion, are the easiest ways of securing victory at the polls. The Montagu Act, introduced with the noblest of motives, instead of preparing the road for self-government, paved the way for communal propagandism ending in red hooliganism.

Miss Mayo chuckles over these riots, and wonders

why they should occur at all if Indians were competent to look after their affairs. "It is the duty of the administration to prevent the occurrence of riots," retorts the Swarajist, and points to the record during the Gandhi era, when the non-co-operators professed to hold the country and lived up to that profession.

Miss Mayo opines that this Hindu-Mahomedan unity of the non-co-operators, régime was farcical:

> "For a time during the political disturbances that followed the war a brief farce of unity was played by the leaders of that day. Mr. Gandhi embraced the Khilafat agitation as embodied in those picturesque freebooters the Ali brothers, if thereby the Mohammedan weight might be swung with his own to embarrass the British administration. But the Khilafat cause itself died an early death. And a single *incident* of the Gandhi-Ali alliance may be cited to illustrate the actual depth of the brotherhood it proclaimed."

She then proceeds to dwell on the Malabar riots and the terrific havoc on life and property. These could hardly be described as "an incident" in accurate English—or for that matter, in American, which is not English. The Malabar tragedy was a terrible catastrophe, the like of which was never known in the history of that beautiful country. As one belonging to Malabar, I can, of course,

speak with greater authority than Miss Mayo. The riots were purely of a socialistic nature. They were agrarian and, in that sense, political and had nothing to do with the Gandhi movement, which did not embrace the agricultural and industrial labourers. The rich landholders were the Hindus, and the poor labourers were Mohammedans, known in Malabar as "Moplas." They are an easily excited lot. Like Pistol, touched with fire, they are hot as gunpowder. Their outburst was against the Janmis (landholders). There have been over a score of Mopla riots, none so wicked or wide, in the past, to suppress which some of the brave police officers, both English and Indian, Hindus and Muslims, have risked their lives. I remember the "incident" of a European collector of Malabar rushing to the scene of riots in Pudanagaram village, where the famous Sedhu was the leader. The collector was in his shirt-sleeves—it was a hot summer's day. After raising his sleeves, he unbuttoned his shirt and coolly presented the bare chest for the Muslim war-knife. The insurgents were in overwhelming numbers, but the dramatic exhibition of courage told. In the twinkling of an eye, the riot ended, and the Moplas admired the "Sahib." Say what one may, there is honour among thieves and the Moplas do not hit below the belt when they know that they have an honourable opponent. When, however, they have a craven foe they become meanly vindictive, and their savagery would put

any primitive savage to shame for the latter's comparatively refined moderation.

Miss Mayo says: "The point that Mr. Gandhi missed, whatever the humorous Ali brothers may privately have thought about it, was this: 'Swaraj to a Mopla could only mean the earthly kingdom of Islam, in which, whatever else happened or failed to happen, no idol-worshipping Hindu would be tolerated alive.'"

When I read this passage of Miss Mayo, I actually began to wonder whether she had visited Malabar. Turning over the pages, I found she had based her observations on hearsay. "A trained American observer, agent of the United States Government" was, she admits her informant.

In the first place, I must point out that the Moplas do not understand Gandhi or the Ali brothers, who do not know Malayalam, the language they speak. Indeed, they would have nothing to do with Gandhi, who drank goat's milk and lived on fruits and sago and preached "Ahimsa" (non-violence). They laughed at non-violence and stood away from the Congress. Truly, the Moplas are not good Mussulmans, in the sense that they worship idols. There is a great temple facing the backwaters in Vaikam. "Vaikathappan," the father of Vaikam, as the Moplas and Hindus call him, is supposed to control the seas and the waves. In the backwaters gales are not infrequent, and the tiny boat of the plucky Mopla can be saved only by

"Vaikathappan," the Hindu god. An eminent Hindu lawyer from Madras was once going to Trivandrum on a case. His boatman was a Mopla. Most of the boatmen of Malabar are Moplas. As the boat reached the Hindu temple, the Mopla stopped rowing and went to offer his prayer. The Hindu lawyer was getting disgusted. In Tamil, which the Mopla could understand, he protested as he was in a hurry to reach his destination. The Mopla is rough and ready. He opened the Hindu's mouth and thrust down his throat some of the "prasad" (temple-offerings) of the god. "Without 'Vaikathappan's permission,' he added, "I dare not row an ell further."

Secondly, the Moplas have been the best protectors of some of the Hindus' temples. Even in the worst days of the riots, it has been a point of honour with them to leave alone the idol and the priest. The fact is, iconoclasm is not a part of their lives. They do not know "Arabic." They do not read the Koran as every Muslim of Upper India does, whether he understands its meaning or not. He has a priest in the person of "Thangal," who is not an Arabic scholar either. The prayer is offered by the Mopla in his own Malayalam, and not in the Prophet's language, as is the practice among the Mohammedans all over the world.

Thirdly, the Mopla women do not live in Purdah as Mohammedan women are supposed to do. They have nothing whatever to do with the Mohammedans outside Malabar. A Mohammedan from the East

Coast who had lived in Malabar for years took a Mopla wife. When, however, he wanted to settle down in his own native place, which was outside Malabar, his wife, who lived with him, and was loyal to him, would not leave Malabar. The Mopla women in this respect are very conservative. They have nothing in common with the Muslims outside Malabar and prefer, therefore, to live in their place their own life. Neither wealth nor business attracts them. "Better a loaf and a herring at home than riches abroad," is their feeling.

Their discontent, however, was increasing owing to rack-renting and other oppressions of the "Janmis," under whom they lived. Many of them had been to the Mesopotamian front and knew something of the war. After repudiating Gandhi and his non-violence, for which they had no use, they organized in their own manner an irregular war. They knew from past experience that they would have to reckon with British troops. They removed the railway lines, cut the telegraphs, besieged the post offices, deported the postmasters, who were generally Hindus, and chopped off the heads of the Muslim constables. Miss Mayo says, "One European planter was murdered at the start," which is true. He was an Englishman, a kind planter, a very good soul, and was really sympathetic in his treatment of the workmen, but he would stand no bullying, facts which Miss Mayo did not perhaps know and does not mention. The fate of the white planter was meted out to

several dark " Janmis "—landed proprietors. The soldiers came on the scene. The Moplas, some of whom had been to war, took refuge in mountain fastnesses. When the cars in which the troops came had left the spot, the Moplas appeared on the scene and savagely punished the Hindus, who informed " the enemy," as they put it, of their manoeuvres, who gave them bread and milk and rendered any other kind of service. The Hindus were followers of Gandhi, believers in non-violence, and therefore resented Mopla violence. They certainly co-operated with the Government, non-co-operators though they were, because they felt that it was part of their " dharma " (duty) as taught them by Gandhi to non-co-operate with all those who resorted to violence.

Not understanding the complexity of the crisis, Gandhi offered to visit the scene. The Hindus of Malabar and the Muslim outside Malabar trembled to think of the recklessness of the Mahatma. But the Government, who knew that the Mopla movement was agrarian and not political, who felt that it was part of their duty to save Gandhi from the rioters, promptly prevented him from entering Malabar. The Ali brothers came forward to go to Malabar and co-operate with the Government. Their offer, too, was wisely rejected, because the Alis had influence only over the non-co-operators, on whom the Moplas had looked with unconcealed contempt even as the Communists look upon the Labour Party.

A real "incident" in what Miss Mayo calls the "Gandhi-Ali Alliance" may be mentioned. This was nothing more or less than the astonishing, but very successful, manner in which the non-co-operators held together the Hindus and the Mohammedans and preserved peace, the like of which they proudly claimed "had not been witnessed since the days of Emperor Akbar." Those whose age-old boast used to be that the Muslim lion and the Hindu lamb would not live together in the jungle of Hindustan but for the presence of the British were, in Lord Reading's words, "puzzled and perplexed."

Lord Northcliffe came to India to have a talk with Lord Reading, and his last message, which was also the most far-sighted from the Imperialistic point of view, was given to the world from Cairo, that the Khilafat should be separated from Swaraj and settled. The Khilafat settled itself. It was dismissed without much ado as a mediaeval rag by the wise men of Angora. Be that as it may, it was necessary to break the "Gandhi-Ali Alliance."

One of the biggest diplomatic brains in the British Empire, who had resigned his office as Lord Chief Justice of England and proceeded to Simla in response to the call of the Empire, was at work. Gandhi was a non-co-operator. Would he, therefore, accept the Viceroy's invitation? There was no point in issuing the invitation unless Gandhi was prepared to accept it. Lord Reading sent for Gandhi's best friends, Rev. Mr. Andrews

and Pandit Malaviya. The pulse of both of these gentlemen began to beat quickly. Never in the history of British rule in India had a Viceroy condescended to invite an arch-agitator. Andrews took the next train from Simla to meet Gandhi, who was attending a marriage ceremony in Allahabad. Of course, Gandhi cheerfully accepted the invitation. Whatever the non-co-operators might think of the first meeting between the Indian saint and the English diplomat, the latter distinctly scored. Lord Reading pointed out to Gandhi that the Ali brothers had preached violence, as certain passages from their speeches distinctly disclosed. Gandhi read, discussed and agreed! "I admire," says the Diplomat, in effect, "your devotion to non-violence and desire to keep the movement free from that taint. I am reluctant to interfere so long as the movement continues to be non-violent. But I shall be compelled to prosecute the Ali brothers unless, of course, they apologize for the violent words they have uttered." Lord Reading knew the weak spot in Gandhi's armour. The Mahatma was crazy about non-violence. He could not help repudiating the Ali brothers unless they were prepared to repudiate themselves. Saint Gandhi straightaway asked the Ali brothers publicly to apologize for one of their notable speeches on the ground that it breathed violence. The brothers were upset. Instead of rejecting the advice of the Hindu Mahatma, the brothers, to avoid a rift in

the lute, accepted his advice, however reluctantly.

The movement advanced from strength to strength. Hindu-Muslim fraternity of the day was not a farce, as Miss Mayo calls it, but a reality. Even a Hindu Sanyasi, a preacher of the Arya Samaj, Swami Shraddhanand, was taken in procession to a mosque, the Juma Musjid at Delhi, to lecture to the Mohammedans. In Hindu processions of a religious character Muslims took part. Aye, Muslims put even " tikkas " (religious marks) on their foreheads, and Hindus drank " Sharbat " at the hands of the Muslims. Never was such fraternizing known between the members of the two communities.

A peaceful revolution was crystallizing. It was based on common political action under the flag of non-co-operation. The non-co-operators gave Government the opportunity to destroy the movement by ordering the boycott of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

Says Miss Mayo :

" When the Prince of Wales sailed to India later in 1921 Mr. Gandhi, then at the height of his popularity, proclaimed to the Hindu world that the coming visit was ' an insult added to injury,' and called for a general boycott.

" Political workers obediently snatched up the torch, rushing it through their organizations, and the Prince's landing in Bombay became

thereby the signal for murderous riot and destruction."

The impression which the above would leave in the minds of the people is that Gandhi and the non-co-operators were out to "insult" the Prince, and the Bombay riots were only a demonstration of that insult. But this is far from the truth. Gandhi was the unhappiest man in India for the turn the events took. His principal adviser in the matter was none other than President Patel, to-day the Speaker of India's Parliament, who had an audience with the King during this summer, when he was in England for a holiday, and who was present in Westminster Hall to take part as one of the members of the Empire Parliamentary Association in the magnificent reception accorded to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York after their very successful tour in the Dominions. Miss Mayo may say that either the spirit of the people has changed or that of Mr. Patel, but nothing of the kind has happened. They were not wanting in loyalty, as Gandhi explained at the time when he ordered the boycott of the visit and not that of the gracious visitor. The non-co-operators were in the middle of a big struggle for Swaraj or self-government. The Government, like any other government similarly situated, would have done all in their power to put down the struggle. When the movement was reaching the zenith of puis-

sance and popularity, Lord Reading, the diplomat-Viceroy, decided to play his trump card. The non-co-operators were not disloyal to King George or his heirs and successors, and therefore His Excellency decided to invite the Prince of Wales. Gandhi at once wrote in *Young India*, his weekly paper, that it was an "insult added to injury," because the people were in the middle of a deep political controversy which they were not prepared to suspend and the suspension of which would considerably injure the movement and demoralize the workers. He felt the invitation of Lord Reading to the first gentleman of the Empire was an insult, because it was calculated to strain the quality of loyalty. The Mahatma, therefore, appealed to the people to love "our brother His Royal Highness," and boycott, if the Viceroy persisted in spite of the public protest in bringing the Prince to break up the movement, not the future Emperor of India, but the action of the Viceroy, which was an act of insult in making the Prince a political or a party instrument.

As for the Bombay riots, they broke out not because of, but in spite of, Gandhi. He immediately called off the boycott, and went into a prolonged fast by way of penance.

Lord Reading himself, impressed by the chivalrous attitude of Gandhi, offered terms of peace and agreed to summon a round table conference, but the saint declined the offer on the ground that he wanted proofs of a change of heart by releasing

unconditionally the Khilafat prisoners and the Ali brothers. He formed a congress volunteer organization throughout the country to enforce strict non-violence while carrying out the programme of boycott. The official campaign of repression which followed weakened the hold of the non-co-operation movement and brought about its final suspension by its leaders. With the stopping of the movement, everything that it stood for was lost sight of. The credulous Hindus and the Muslims could easily be exploited by the skilful propagandist who played on their feelings. The political agitation for Swaraj was replaced by the communal agitation whose goal was riot.

Miss Mayo speaks of "the political disturbances that followed the war." She was not in India during the war, but if her insinuation is that India was politically disturbed during the war, hampering the Government, she is very wrong. Princes and people alike vied with each other in giving their all to the Empire. Indian soldiers were fighting on every front. The loyalty of the Indian people was so complete that Lord Hardinge could pride himself in saying that India was "bled white" of British and Indian soldiers who had proceeded to the French front to stem the tide of the German advance on Paris. Whatever the surmise of American tourists may be, it is a matter for deep gratification to Indians—whose relations after all are with England and not America—that England has fully appreciated India's rally.

Though the war has vanished largely into the limbo of oblivion, it does my heart good to feel that India's contribution is still remembered by great Englishmen. While I was lunching with Mr. Lloyd George the other day and discussing the question of the future of India, that great Welshman, whose services to Britain during the war will be preserved in the pages of history and enshrined in the affectionate recollections of generations yet unborn, spoke with joy and gratitude of India's spontaneous response.

Tilak, whom Sir Valentine Chirol has described truly as "father of the Indian unrest," was the first to furl the flag of politics and become a recruiting agent himself, calling on the Mahrattas to enrol themselves. Gandhi was carrying on his recruiting campaign in Gujerat. The Nationalist Maharaja of Nabha, known for his political and personal independence, was the first among the Princes of India to wire to the Viceroy direct, on reading the news of the declaration of war, placing the entire resources, the houses, the sepoys and the moneys of the State at the disposal of the Government. The differences, His Highness frankly wrote, were between two administrations on matters of minor detail, but to his Imperial Majesty King George and the Royal House of Windsor, every Indian prince and peasant was devoted and loyal. Whatever the differences of his Durbar with the political Agent and the Provincial Government, the Pulkhian house of Nabha

was connected with the Royal House of Windsor by the golden chain of true love and loyalty of a devoted vassal. So was the house of every other prince, of peasants and people. Well might every Indian claim England's calamity was not India's opportunity. Anyone who reads Miss Mayo's book will think it was. On the contrary, India realized and proudly discharged her responsibility as a loyal and integral part of the Empire.

CHAPTER XIII

THE REFORMS

"Rest is nearing, Toil is ending,
Homeward now our path is bending,
Right is lasting, Wrong is leaving,
Earth ere long shall cease its grieving."

HORATIUS BONAR.

MISS MAYO says that the reforms have transferred "much power, place and patronage" from British into Indian hands.

Let us impartially examine how much "power" the reforms have transferred to the Indian people.

The Government of India are responsible, as they have always been, to the British Cabinet and the Secretary of State for India, who in their turn are responsible to British Parliament, who are supposed to be responsible to the British people, who take little interest in Indian affairs, as evidenced by the hesitation of each and every party to make India a live question during the General Elections. According to the Reform "Constitution of India," it is the British electorate to whom

the Government of India are responsible and not the Indian people. Take the constitution of "India's Parliament," as the Indian Legislative Assembly is extravagantly termed in some special publications. The Opposition is elected in the main, but the Powers-that-be are permanent, whether they have a majority or not in India's Parliament. They have no General Election to face; their constituency being the Viceregal lodge! Whenever this Parliament happens to pass any resolution, such as the repeal of repressive laws and regulations or the rejection of the Lee Committee Report, it is thrown into the Viceroy's waste-paper basket. The Viceroy has powers of "certification" even as the King of England has the right of veto. The King, being a constitutional monarch, does not exercise that prerogative, which, on the other hand, the Viceroy frequently does. His responsibility is to a government and people separated from him by more than half the world. Where, then, is "the power" of which Miss Mayo speaks? But, she argues, if India's parliament is a make-believe, is not the power extended to the Provincial parliaments real and considerable? The evidence given before a committee of enquiry, known as the Muddiman Committee, named after the president of that Commission, Sir Alexander Muddiman, the then Home Member of the Government of India, by ministers and ex-ministers in regard to departments transferred to their control, reveals their

powerlessness. Their complaint was that their departments were starved out for want of funds over which they had no control. That control is exercised by the reserved department in the person of the Finance Member, who owes his appointment or nomination to the permanent government. In the provinces also the Powers-that-be are nominated and have no general election to face, excepting two or three dummy ministers who have no control over the finances, or the departments which usually affect the people, such as law, police and justice. Surely there is no power even in the provincial sphere.

Let us examine what is "the place" which Miss Mayo says is extended to India under the Reforms. Perhaps she refers to the representation of India at the Empire Conference. But who appoints the representative? The Government of India and not the people. No wonder the Indians say there is no direct representation of India in the Empire Conference. The least little that could have been done to placate Indian opinion was to have asked the Indian Legislative Assembly to elect its nominees to the Empire Conference. This would not have been necessary if India's Parliament were responsible to the people and the leader of the House happened to be, as in every other country, the leader of the largest group in the House. In the meantime, to give a representative character to India's representation in the Empire Conference, it would not have been too much to

have called on the Central Legislature to find its own nominee. The Legislature is not the people's but the Government's creation. Therefore it could be safely trusted to elect its man, but even this is not expected of the Government by the Reforms.

What is "the patronage" of which Miss Mayo speaks? One of such patronage is the Statutory Commission of Enquiry in 1929, or an earlier period, the object of which is to examine India's fitness for Swaraj. Indians do not like this patronage. Sitting in judgment over them as if they were a nation of schoolboys? What they want is not a periodical examination by their masters, but a "settlement," as Colonel Wedgwood truly said in the House of Commons, of the Indian question, not by sending out a formal commission, but entering into a treaty with India, even as England has entered into an agreement with Ireland. But even this commission is disturbing the peace of the class which Miss Mayo represents, who would bolster up the claims of the Indian States. Miss Mayo warns against the folly of hasty progress in two-thirds of India, called British India, lest it should affect disastrously the remaining one-third of British India called the Indian States. Miss Mayo would make out that the loyal Princes of India are working against the Nationalist movement. Were it so, the Congress would not be quiet. The Indian National Congress has been adopting a policy of non-interference with the

Indian States. Miss Mayo is obviously for a policy of using the Indian States as a buffer against the Nationalist movement, and such of those Indian chiefs as have a personality and patriotism, as have been unwilling to play the buffer, must be, as in the past, forced to abdicate.

Having examined the so-called "power, place and patronage" of the Reforms which the American authoress extols, let us follow her own impressions of the Legislators. She says:

> "The scheme in its shape of to-day has not the stability of the slow-growing oak, root for branch, balanced and anchored. Rather, it is a hothouse exotic, weedy, a stranger in its soil, forced forward beyond its inherent strength by the heat of generous and hasty emotion. An outside sitting to-day through sessions of Indian legislatures, Central or Provincial, somehow comes to feel like one observing a roomful of small and rather mischievous children who by accident have got hold of a magnificent watch. They fight and scramble to thrust their fingers into it, to pull off a wheel or two, to play with the mainspring; to pick out the jewels. They have no apparent understanding of the worth of the mechanism, still less of the value of time. And when the teacher tries to explain to them how to wind their toy up, they shriek and grimace in fretful impatience and stuff their butterscotch into the works."

Opinions and impressions differ. Addressing a meeting of the members of the Legislative Assembly, a British Member of Parliament, Mr. Oswald Mosley, said that he found the proceedings of the Central Legislature too tame, too dull. There was not, he said, the parliamentary "ferocity" to which he had looked forward in a country struggling for freedom. In reply, Pandit Motilal Nehru, the Leader of the Opposition, said, with his characteristically pleasant sarcasm: "Owing to centuries of alien rule, Indians had lost all ferocity."

Mr. Aldous Huxley, whose vision was not blurred by politics or prejudice, seemed to see more of the inwardness of the Legislative drama that is staged twice a year in Simla and Delhi.

> "The Legislative Assembly passes a great many resolutions. The Government acts on about one in every hundred of them. Indians are not very enthusiastic about their budding parliament. It is not, perhaps, to be wondered at. Indian politicians find it useful, I suppose, because they can talk more violently within the Chamber than without. The violent speeches are reported in the Press. It is all good propaganda, no doubt. But it is nothing more. The Government members are, of course, well aware that it is nothing more. Some do not even take the trouble to conceal their knowledge, but adopt throughout the sittings of the Assembly

a consistently flippant attitude of amused and secure superiority."

As a member of that Assembly, it won't do for me to keep quiet. There is, of course, much truth in Mr. Huxley's statement, when he says, "it is good propaganda, no doubt," "violent speeches are reported in the press." One of the purposes of the idealists' entry into the Legislature is to take advantage of the privilege of the House. If these spitfires were to talk the same thing outside the House, they are sure to be "locked up"! Many of them have known jail life. The Leader of the Opposition, Pandit Motilal Nehru himself is an ex-jailbird, but he is suave of manner and sweet in phrases. Many of his followers copy his sweet reasonableness, while some impossible spirits love to abuse the privilege of the House. "The simplest piece of essential legislation," says Miss Mayo, "proposed by the Government evoked from the Swarajist orators fantastic interpretations of sinister intent. The gravest concerns elicited from them only a bedlam of frivolous and abusive chatter. We do not trust you, they would repeat in effect, we know your motives are bad! we believe nothing good of your *thrice-damned alien government*." (My italics.)

I do not for a moment deny that strong speeches are made in the Assembly, but not stronger than those made in the House of Commons. President Patel, who had come to study the proceedings of

the House of Commons, in a statement to the Press, said that India's parliament had nothing to learn in the direction of dignity from the Mother of Parliaments. Most unparliamentary things are said in Parliament. Most undignified scenes are its "striking" feature. The absence of them in the Assembly bored Mr. Mosley, who frankly confessed it to the gentlemen of the Central Legislature. It is on the very lack of them that the pandits and leaders pride. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, the Hindu leader, who is an embodiment of dignity and courtesy, arraigned the gentleman who used the phrase "Thrice-damned Government," which Miss Mayo quotes. That was exactly what he dreaded—that these phrases would be hurled against them as exhibiting a lack of seriousness. These venerable gentlemen ought to attend Parliaments in the west when they are in Session. They are oppressed with an excessive sense of dignity. My own opinion is that the worst statements and scenes in the Assembly pale into nothingness when compared with similar scenical situations in the western legislatures. "

Says Miss Mayo: "Hour after hour, day after day, the Swarajist bench spent their energies in sterile obstructionist tactics." This statement is not correct, but supposing it were true, have not the Swarajists the right to resort to obstruction? Did not Parnell resort to it in the House of Commons? But the fact is that the Swarajist leader

has got into a good deal of trouble with the Left wing for eschewing obstruction. To understand this and the slow, steady manner in which the Swaraj Party have been settling down as constitutionalist, it is necessary to scratch the thin ice on which Miss Mayo skates.

With the suspension of the non-co-operation movement, the old Nationalists resumed their brains and decided to enter the councils and practice obstruction. This was the original idea of the late Mr. C. R. Das, the great Bengal leader, but a special session of the Congress held at Calcutta would not accept it. It wanted something stronger. Therefore, it gave a majority of votes to Mahatma Gandhi and his campaign of non-co-operation. It was certainly supported by Mr. Das, whom Bengal and India hailed as "Deshabhandu" (Saviour of the Motherland). When, however, the non-co-operation movement had ceased to move, the Deshabhandu revived his old idea of obstruction in the Legislatures. As he did not have the support of the Congress, which still adhered to no change in the non-co-operation programme, he formed what came to be known as the Swaraj Party. With the passing away of Mr. C. R. Das, the Swaraj Party, under the leadership of Pandit Motilal Nehru, imperceptibly settled down to a policy of opposition-cum-co-operation. Obstruction, which had succeeded in Bengal in suspending dyarchy, the last achievement of the Deshabhandu, was, after his passing

away, suspended actually, if not verbally, as an active policy of the party. In the winter session of the Legislative Assembly of 1926–27, the Swaraj Party abstained from making, as in previous years, the rejection of the Financial Bill on the ground of "no taxation without representation," a party question. Last year, when Miss Mayo's "thrice-damned" member of the Swaraj Party moved the rejection of the Finance Bill, he was clearly incurring the displeasure of the mighty stalwart who led the Party. The Secretary and the Whip of the Swaraj Party remained neutral when the motion was pressed to a division. The leader of the Party was absent from the House. Only irresponsible extremists like Lala Lajpat Rai, also known as "The Lion of the Punjab," and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, also known as "Dharmatma" (the soul of goodness) and their satellites voted for the extreme step, but not the saner Swarajists. Surely this is not Swarajist obstruction, but plain and simple co-operation. Miss Mayo does great injustice to the loyal section of the Swarajists, whom the great Moderate Party, headed by Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, ex-Minister of the U.P. Government, one of the ablest journalists in India, ardent disciple of Dadhabhai Naorogi, first Indian M.P., and a devotee of Lord Morley, has welcomed into the ranks of the Liberal League with open hands.

"Little or nothing constructive," says Miss Mayo, "emanated from party benches." But

the most constructive thing that emanated from the Swarajist bench was that they did not want Swaraj or Dominion Status straight away, but only a settlement "One step enough for me," felt the Swaraj Party leader. He only wanted to see the distant gates of Eden gleam.

Brushing aside the impossible idealism of the young man in a hurry who would ask for the moon, the leader of the Swaraj Party moved, on behalf of himself and of all other parties in the Assembly, a constructive and moderate resolution asking for provincial autonomy and partial responsibility at the Central Government as the next immediate stage in the Reforms.

This was in August 1925, when the findings of the Reforms Enquiry Committee were considered in the Indian Legislative Assembly, and an important amendment embodying India's National Demand was passed *receiving the support of members of all the Indian parties.* In moving the amendment, Pandit Motilal Nehru summarized the demand as follows.

"We want responsible Government in the Central Legislature. We want the Executive to be responsible to the Legislature except in certain particulars detailed here, namely, the expenditure on military services up to a fixed limit, expenditure classed as political and foreign and payment of debts and liabilities. Then in the Provincial Governments we ask for provincial autonomy, we want the abolition of dyarchy. We reserve our

right to frame our own constitution after the fixed period during which you are to have exceptional powers has ended. The next step we ask you to take after declaring these principles in Parliament is to constitute whatever agency you like—we have said a convention, a round table conference or some other suitable agency—it does not matter what name you call it—but it must be a representative agency, adequately representative of all Indian, European and Anglo-Indian interests. That agency is to frame a scheme with due regard to the interests of all minorities. When this scheme is framed it is to be laid before Parliament as was done in the case of the Dominions, and is to be followed by a statute embodying it. The fundamental principle on which a constitution for India is to be based must be the principle of self-determination."

All parties united in their demand that this system of dyarchy should be replaced in the provinces by one of responsible government. They would also extend the sphere of responsibility to the Central Government, but would not ask for the whole hog. They would, in deference to the wishes of the Government, leave Army, Navy, Foreign Affairs and Indian States in the hands of the Government. The extremists thought that the leader of the Swaraj Party had caught the Moderates and Liberals bathing and walked away with their garments. The Liberals, however, were content to be left "in the full enjoyment of their

Liberal position," as Disraeli would say, so long as the Swarajist leader was the custodian of their garments !

Pandit Nehru has roused the suspicions of the extremists in the country, who fear that he and his party might even secede from the Congress like the old Moderates and go over completely to the side of the Government and work the Reforms, if the Government accept the compromise, which clearly falls short of Dominion status. If he has roused their suspicions, he has done so deliberately and with open eyes. The Pandit has never been a believer in the spiritual idealism of the East, or the socialism of the West. He is a man of the world with abundant commonsense and a penetrating head for practical politics. So far as temperament, taste and outlook are concerned, he has more in common with the conservative aristocrat of England than middle class Liberal and Labour Parties.

Miss Mayo would make out that democracy does not suit India. She says :

> " Despotism induces no growth of civic spirit, and the peoples of India, up to the coming of Britain, had known no rule but that of despots. Britain, by her educational effort, has gradually raised up an element before unknown in India—a middle class. But this middle class—these lawyers and professional men—are in the main as much dominated to-day as were their

ancestors five hundred years ago by the law of caste and of transmigration—completest denial of democracy."

But does democracy suit the United States? Is democracy the most efficient institution in the world? Let us hear Mr. Aldous Huxley on the point:

"No cant, no democracy; therefore, let there be cant. The implication of course is that democracy is something excellent, an ideal to be passionately wished for. But after all is democracy really desirable? European nations certainly do not seem to be finding it so at the moment. And even self-determination is not so popular as it was. There are plenty of places in what was once the Austrian Empire, where the years of Hapsburg tyranny are remembered as a golden age, and the old bureaucracy is sincerely regretted. And what is democracy anyhow? Can it be said that government by the people exists anywhere except perhaps in Switzerland? Certainly, the English parliamentary system cannot be described as government by the people. It is a government by oligarchs for the people and with the people's occasional advice. Do I mean anything whatever when I say that democracy is a good thing? Am I expressing a reasoned opinion? Or do I merely repeat a meaningless formula by force of habit and because it was drummed into me at an early

age, I wonder? And that I am able to wonder with such a perfect detachment is due, of course, to the fact that I was born in the upper-middle governing class of an independent, rich, and exceedingly powerful nation. Born an Indian or brought up in the slums of London, I should hardly be able to achieve so philosophical a suspense of judgment."

The parties in the Assembly have not asked for the transplanting of the venerable oak of the American democracy into India. Where, then, does the occasion arise for Miss Mayo to use such cheap flings as "adepts in the phraseology of democratic representation, they are in fact profoundly innocent" of what they mean; but they have said exactly what they mean and meant exactly what they said.

The Swarajist Party and its leader are in the market place, willing to be sold and bought; in fairness it must be said theirs is not a personal price. They will not sell their soul for a mess of pottage, which accounts for their not accepting office under the present Reforms. Theirs is a political, an impersonal, a national price. If the British Government are willing to pay that price, the loyalty and co-operation of the only dominating political section in the country will be bought, which has for its leader the tallest man in the country after Mahatma Gandhi. If, however, Whitehall does not pay the price nothing would

suit the Indian extremist better, whatever Miss Mayo might say to the contrary. The only block in the way of idealism will then disappear. The movement of non-co-operation will be revived in a more aggressive form and carried out with more far-reaching result. Gandhi is only biding his time.

CHAPTER XIV

IF "BRITONS" WITHDREW?

"The light of smiles shall fill again
The lids that overflow with tears,
And weary hours of woe and pain
Are promises of happier years."

W. C. BRYANT.

THE American tourist's chapter on the "Sons of the Prophet," as she calls the children of Islam, is an amusing study in psychology. She says these "Sons of the Prophet" are waiting for the withdrawal of the British to kill the Hindus outright. The backbone of the Muslims is the Frontier Province. Behind the frontier tribesman is the Afghan—"The man who walks like a bear—fingering gold and whispering ceaselessly of the glories of a rush across the border that shall sweep the crescent through the strong Muslim Punjab, gathering Islam in its train; that shall raise the Muslims of the South and so shall close from both sides, like a tide for ever, over the heads of the Hindus. "Why not?" asks the Bear, "are you

feebler men than your fathers? What stops you? The English?"

If the Amir or the Afghan is actually saying to the Muslims of India, "I, the Bear, am behind you. Look at the loot and the killings. Drive in your wedge! Strike."* If, indeed, the above statement is true, then surely the Hindus must be fond of the British, and the Muslims must be their heartiest haters and opponents.

But Miss Mayo says that the Muslims are loyal to the core, and at the core. She quotes as her authority resolutions† adopted by several Muslim associations, to show that they did not even want the reforms, that they want the British to stay on in the fullness of their power. She makes "a mountain-bred man of Persian ancestry" on the Frontiers the spokesman of Islam. He meets her and swears to her that "the whole province is satisfied now and desires no change. As for these little folk of the South, we have never called them men. If the British withdraw, immediate hell will follow, in the first days of which the Bengali and all his tribe will be removed from the earth." This may look like a fable, but it is Miss Mayo's own truth! Really, she is either too credulous or too imaginative. Muslims, especially the tribesmen, are, we are told, born raiders waiting for the English to go, to sweep like a hurricane over the Hindu India. Surely the

---

* *Mother India*, page 286. † page 300.

English, who deny them their alleged master-passion could not be their object of love.

Miss Mayo's contradictions are confusing. It shows into what a mess she has got. Her attempt only covers her with discredit. It may, however, deceive the superficial reader. Instead of writing a book, if she had written a series of articles, her contradictions and deductions might not be so pronounced.

Here is another sample of her contradictions of herself. She tells us at the very beginning of her book that the Hindus and especially the Brahmins, as you find them to-day, are degenerates, mentally, morally and physically. But during the Muslim period, and the Moghul period, she admits the Hindus, and especially the Brahmins, were the brain of the administration. The Brahmins were, to the Moghul India, what the European I.C.S. is to the British Government. Let us quote her own words:

"The Mahommedan, though he learned his Koran and his Persian verse, was, as a rule, an open-air sort of man, who would rarely bother his own head with pens or books. Therefore, whenever some Brahmin, with *his quick brain and facile memory*, acquired a knowledge of Persian, and thereby released his further store of learning for the master's use, he was apt to find a desirable *niche in Government's service*." Therefore, the Muslim *raj* was not so fiendish as Miss Mayo would make out. The British, perhaps, do not give the

same opportunity to the Hindu competitors. This, in the opinion of an impartial Englishman, is the crux of the trouble. Mr. Aldous Huxley writes in *Jesting Pilate* :

" Most Englishmen, who love India, will tell you that they love the Indians. For peasants, for workmen, for sepoys, for servants, they feel nothing but a benevolent and fatherly affection. They greatly admire the orthodox Brahmin, who thinks it wrong to cross the seas, and whose learning is all mythology, Sanskrit and a fabulous kind of history. Still greater is their admiration for the Rajput noble, that picturesque survival from the age of chivalry ; he rides well, plays a good game of tennis, and is in every respect a Pucca sahib—that is to say, a sportsman with good manners, a code of morals not vastly different from that current in the public schools and no intellectual accomplishments or pretensions. The only class of Indians you find they object to as a class are those who have received a western education. The reason is sufficiently obvious. The educated Indian is the Englishman's rival and would-be supplanter. To the slavish and illiterate mass, the European is manifestly superior. Nor can the pandit, entangled in his orthodoxy and learned only in Sanskrit; the sporting nobleman, learned in nothing, ever challenge the supremacy which he owes to his western training. All these he can afford to love, protectively. But no man loves another who threatens to deprive him of his privileges and

powers. The educated Indian is not popular with the Europeans. It is only to be expected."

If the Hindu campaign succeeds, if the English withdraw, India will be bathed in blood, Miss Mayo says. If the British want to withdraw from India, even as the ancient Romans withdrew from Britain, Miss Mayo and her admirers may take it from me that Indians will not follow the undignified example of the feeble ancestors of the American lady and beseech the modern Romans on bended knees and with tearful eyes, to stay on and defend India by land and sea. The Hindu, whom Miss Mayo misrepresents, has not asked the English to clear out, bag and baggage. All that he wants is Dominion status. If Miss Mayo and her informers do not think that there is a half-way house between the present autocracy and permanent withdrawal, they may please themselves—but statesmanship is not so bankrupt.

In this connection, it will be of some interest to note that there is much in common between British rule in India, as given in Miss Mayo's book, and Roman rule in England.

First: Says the English historian*—"Their (Roman) occupation of the land (Britain) was mainly a military one, and they never succeeded in teaching the mass of *the natives* to abandon their

* Oman's *History of England.*

Celtic tongue and to take up Roman customs and habits" (*my italics*). A wit may observe, by the way, the Britons do not seem to have been so sensitive about the use of the word "natives" as the Indians. The use of the word has been proscribed by the British Government in deference to Indian sentiment.

Miss Mayo also refers to the English-educated Indian sticking to the "horrid" Indian customs and habits. Her exaggerated opinions apart, the fact remains that even the educated Indian who talks faultless English adheres to the Indian customs. The object of Macaulay, who was responsible for making English the medium of instruction, was "to form a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect." * The Orientalists opposed it at the time. Quite recently Mahatma Gandhi led a campaign for the boycott of the British schools, which were described as "gulam khanas" (manufacturers of slaves). Those Indians who think their taste is better than that of other people's and their morals superior, have always resisted and cried down the tendency towards Europeanization. Romans did not Romanize Britain. The British have not Britonized India.

Secondly: Another aspect of similarity between Roman rule in Britain and British rule in India may be noted.

* Macaulay's famous minute (1835).

" The towns indeed were Romanized and great military centres, like Eboracum and Deva, or commercial centres, like London, were filled with a Latin-speaking population and boasted of fine temples, baths and public buildings." (Oman's *History of England.*)

" Calcutta, second largest city in the British Empire, spread along the Ganges, called Hooghly. Calcutta, big, Western, modern, with public buildings, monuments, parks, gardens. . . . Rich Calcutta ! Wide open door to the traffic of the world. . . ." (*Mother India.*)

Thirdly : Says the English historian about un-Romanized England :

" But the villagers of the open country and the Celtic landholders who dwelt among them, were very little influenced by the civilization of the town-dwellers and lived on by themselves much in the same way as their ancestors, worshipping the same Celtic gods, using the same rude tools and vessels and dwelling in the same low clay huts."

Says Miss Mayo about un-Britonized India :

" Little dark people with cheery-coloured garments, almost black people, with big, bristling mops of curly black hair, drawing water out of wells as they drew it a thousand years ago, or threshing grain under the circling feet of bullocks, small clay villages, each small house eclipsed under a big round palm leaf room like a candle-snuffer."

Fourthly : " The Romans," says the historian,

"greatly changed the face of Britain by their engineering works." (A.D. 43.)

The British engineers are not wanting in India, but the malaria-stricken, mosquito-bitten face of India remains unchanged.

Says Miss Mayo: "Malaria, altogether, is one of the great and costly curses of the land, not alone because of its huge death-rate, but even more because of the lowered physical and social conditions that it produces, with their invitation to other forms of disease!" (A.D. 1927.)

"What a magnificent country India would be if only this malaria was abolished," observed an Englishman *, who could speak with authority on the subject, "and I am quite certain of this, that if instructions were given by the engineers in the employ of the British Government in India to abolish malaria, and allowed the requisite sums of money, they would soon make a great change." The same writer proceeds to point out: "If only the rulers of India could give their minds to these questions which concern the lives and health and well-being of the people, instead of wasting their energies on other matters of no importance, India might be made a Sanatorium." The same writer gives a striking instance.

"The banks of the Panama Canal were made into a place that could be visited as a sanatorium in consequence of the successful efforts of the engineer

* Arnold Lupton, *Happy India.*

in charge to abolish malaria, and the malaria of the Panama Canal was the deadliest kind the world has ever known."

Miss Mayo ought to know what was done in Panama. It is nearer her home than Bengal. There is no use saying that the villages of Bengal and other parts of India are in low level; they are not on a lower level than Holland. When I was in the Netherlands, the one thing that struck me was the manner in which the Dutch have been fighting their natural disadvantage with nature's aid. Windmills, steam-engines, oil-engines, hydro-electric power; all these can be pressed into service in India also, where there are abundant natural facilities.

Miss Mayo declares that "governmental anti-malarial work, like all other preventive sanitation, is badly crippled," because of "present conditions of Indianized control." Sanitation and public health became a transferred subject only in 1919. What had the Government been doing for the previous century and a half, when India was not mocked with shadowy reforms and when the British Government was the sole, unquestioned ruler, without even advisory councils? "Sanitation," said the Swarajist opponents of reform, "was made a transferred subject instead of jails and police, because the Government deliberately wanted to transfer the sins of omission of the last one hundred and fifty years of British rule on to Indian shoulders." The Swarajists warned the

Indian ministers against taking office without power of the purse. That, however, wholly rests with the Government. In their love of office, as their enemies charge them, but in the sincere hope of doing good, as they themselves declare, the Moderates took up ministerships. Sir Surendranath Bannerjee died a broken-hearted man because the dream of his life, of extirpating malaria from Bengal, even as it was eradicated from the banks of the Panama Canal, could not be realized. This Minister asked for money; but no money was forthcoming. The Indian ministers have borne painful testimony to this incontrovertible fact.*

Fifthly: "The Romans improved the farming of the country," says the historian, "so much so that in years of scarcity the corn of Britain fed Northern Gaul."

"The Britons," as Miss Mayo chooses to call the British, have sent a well-intentioned farmer-Viceroy to India, whose first achievement was the Agricultural Commission. It remains to be seen whether "this mountain in labour" brings forth something better than the proverbial "mouse." If Lord Irwin cannot succeed in bringing about a new era in Indian agriculture, nobody else can achieve the object in view.

As for the exporting of the Indian corn, the people and princes have asked for a restriction in export

* Evidence of Ministers before the Muddiman Committee of Enquiry on Indian Reforms.

in times of scarcity "It seems a pity that grain should be exported out of India," said a Maharaja, "when the children of the soil can hardly buy enough thereof to keep body and soul together. It would certainly be conducive to the general well-being if in times of scarcity some restrictions were placed on the free exportation of grain."*

Miss Mayo laughs at the idea of India's complaining against the export of foodstuffs. "Grain travels to and from India," says she, "as it does anywhere else." According to Miss Mayo, India is as good as anywhere else for purposes of exportation, but as bad as nowhere else when it is a question of granting her Swaraj.

Sixthly : "Gauls, Italians, Greeks and Orientals came to share in the trade of Britain, and at the same time many of its natives must have crossed to the Continent, notably those who were sent to serve in the auxiliary cohorts of Britons."

Foreigners have come to share in the trade of India also, though "the Britons" would rather have Empire preference. Such preference was shown in regard to British steel as against Continental steel.† The Indian soldiers crossed the seas to fight England's battle on three fronts. It did my eyes good to see that on the principal

* Indian Legislative Council proceedings (1908).

† Assembly Debate (1927).

pillars of the Menin Gate in Ypres were inscribed the names of Indian soldiers, who died so that the Empire might live as the guardian of the world's democracy.

Miss Mayo says India is not fit for democracy, which should be denied to her. Is it because the Romans had denied it to England also? The Roman bureaucracy was so benevolent that the Britons were deeply affected when Rome abandoned them owing to the vices of internal maladministration, and the assaults of barbarous invaders under which the Imperial capital was sinking. "Britain, therefore, ceased to belong to the Roman Empire," says the historian, "not because it wished to throw off the yoke, but because its masters declared that they could no longer protect." Pathetic appeals were sent to Rome by the poor Britons when "the savage Picts and Saxons" invaded Britain. "The groans of the Britons," as these petitions and appeals were called, ran thus: "The barbarians drive us into the sea, the sea drives us back on to the barbarians, our only choice is whether we shall die by the sword or drown, for we have no one to save us."

That would be the fate of India, also, in the opinion of Miss Mayo, if Britain withdrew; but "the silly Hindus" want the British to go! This is a figment of her imagination.

Not the Hindus only, but the Muslims also have so far asked only for Swaraj—not the bag-and-

baggage clear-out. To borrow the words of His Imperial Majesty the King Emperor: "*For years, it may be for generations, patriotic and loyal Indians have dreamed of Swaraj for the Motherland.*" * For Miss Mayo's edification, it may be added: Indians have been dreaming of Swaraj because, if the Britons leave India, even as the Romans left Britain, India should not be in the helpless state in which the ancient Britons were.

His Imperial Majesty added: "To-day you have the beginning of Swaraj within my Empire, and widest scope and ample opportunity for progress to the liberty which my other Dominions enjoy." The people of India contend that there can be no beginning of Swaraj without a national army. Home Defence must precede Home Rule. There has been much futile constitution-making, but the bulwark of all constitutions, which is a national army, is denied. The Military Budget cannot be voted on by the Indian Legislative Assembly. And there is not even a single military college in India. The Prince of Wales' Military College in Dehra Dun is only a public school of a preparatory type. A Committee presided over by Sir Andrew Skeen has drawn up a report, but the British Government have yet to shape their intention of introducing military colleges in India. Do they

* Message of His Majesty the King-Emperor, delivered to the people of India by H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught, at the opening ceremony of the Indian Legislature, 9th February, 1921.

want to leave India in the same conditions in which the Saxons found the Britons after the desertion of Rome?

Miss Mayo will say "yes," but the Englishman will say "no"—an emphatic "no."

CHAPTER XV

PRINCES AND PEOPLE

"Thou must be true thyself
If thou the truth wouldst teach;
Thy soul must overflow if thou
Another soul would reach."

MORSEL.

ANYONE who does not know India will think after reading *Mother India* that the ruling chiefs in their States and the peoples of British India are at the point of breaking out against each other, sword in hand. She paints the Princes as being full of contempt for the politician and the politician as boiling with disgust against the Princes. The British are supposed to be packing off and the Princes are preparing to take their place. That is the extraordinary picture which the American traveller is presenting to her readers.

If one's object is to sow the seeds of misunderstanding and mischief between the Princes and the people of India, one cannot do better than misrepresent the one to the other and both to

the outside world. This is exactly what the American tourist has essayed to achieve:

She says:

"The Swarajists, it would appear, forget that the moment Government were placed in their hands, the Princes would flash into the picture as powers in the land, severally to be reckoned with exactly as they were a century ago; and the Indian army, if it hung together at all, might be more likely to follow one of the outstanding Princes rather than the commands of a Legislative Assembly composed of a type that India has never known or obeyed."

This is enough to rouse the worst suspicions of the people. By talking loosely about the Princes and their plans, when the British withdraw, Miss Mayo only plays on the politicians' suspicions.

"The Princes knew well that if Britain were to withdraw from India, they themselves, each for himself, would at once begin annexing territory . . . the present-day politician would in the first onset finally disappear like a whiff of chaff from before flame."

Miss Mayo further tells us that one of the Princes told her: "While Britain stays, Britain will send us English gentlemen to speak for the King-Emperors and all will be well, as it should be between friends. If Britain leaves, we, the Princes, will know how to straighten out India, even as the Princes should."

Miss Mayo has hardly any doubt that the Princes would with facility and ferocity execute their plans. With admiration, she speaks of them as "A company of high-spirited militant aristocrats, . . . absolutely refusing to carry their complacence so far as to admit the Indian politician of the Reforms Government as an agent to their court. Their supreme contempt of that class is not unmingled with distinct irritation that the Power to which they acknowledge fealty stoops to parley with what seems to them an impudent and ridiculous *canaille.*"

We wonder what the politician thinks of it all. Miss Mayo recalls a little party given in Delhi. "Most of the guests were like my hosts, Bengalee Hindus, belonging to the western educated professional class. They had spoken at length on the coming expulsion of Britain from India and on the future in which they themselves would rule the land.

" 'And what,' Miss Mayo asked, 'is your plan for the Princes?' "

" 'We shall wipe them out,' exclaimed one, with conviction. And all nodded assent."

This in brief is a picture of a lost Dominion. What will be the impression the book will create in foreign countries? It will be concluded that there seems to be common agreement between the Princes and the people on one point at least, that the British are going away and it only remains to settle as to whether sovereignty should be transferred to the people or the Princes.

Let us picture to ourselves a scene at an American tea-party of easily misguided people.

"Have you read *Mother India?*" begins the amiable hostess, who has the reputation of having read all the latest books.

"Yes, isn't it awful! The British are leaving India!"

"But look how the Indians themselves hate each other."

"And why should the common people hate the Princes?"

"Oh, hate begets hate, even as trust begets trust."

"And the Princes have no sympathy with the people in the struggle for freedom?"

"None at all. They are bitter against the politicians and sorry that the British should be truckling to them. And both the Princes and the people think that the British expulsion is drawing near! Yes, they openly talk about it. Miss Mayo has wonderful memory. She has reported word for word what the Princes and the home rulers have in turn confided to her."

"Could they not work amicably together?"

"Oh, no. Did not Milton's *Satan* say: 'Never can true reconcilement grow where wounds of deadly hate have pierced so deep'?"

"But what are the wounds? Where is the cause of the trouble?"

"Oh, well, the Princes are aristocrats with ruling powers. And aristocrats look down with

contempt in the East on the commoner fellows."

Miss Mayo gives a serious account of the plans of the Princes in *Mother India* (page 282):

"Here is a story, from the lips of one whose veracity has never, I believe, been questioned. The time was that stormy period in 1920, when the new Reforms Act was casting doubt over the land and giving rise to the persistent rumour that Britain was about to quit India. My informant, an American of long experience, was visiting one of the more important of the Princes—a man of great charm, cultivation and force, whose work for his State was of the first order. The Prince's Dewan was also present, and the three gentlemen had been talking at ease as became the old friends that they were.

"'His Highness does not believe,' said the Dewan, 'that Britain is going to leave India. But still, under this new régime in England, they may be so ill advised. So His Highness is getting his troops in shape, accumulating munitions and coining silver. And if the English do go, three months afterwards, *not a rupee or a virgin will be left in all Bengal.*"

"To this His Highness, sitting in his capital distant from Bengal by half the breadth of India, cordially agreed. His ancestors through ages had been predatory Mahratta chiefs." (*Note the italics.*) The American tourist mentions the period exactly when the talk took place—1920.

But the same conversation actually took place twenty years ago, as recorded with some accuracy and amusement by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, who visited India when Lord Morley was the Secretary of State. He recorded his impressions in the book *Awakening of India*. On page 25 is reported the interesting conversation which Miss Mayo has more than two decades after revived with the imagination for which some American sensation-mongers have a reputation. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald wrote :

" The first Rajput chief I met, the well-known Sir Pratap Singh, of whom so many romantic tales are told, was deploring the fact that the hand of age was upon him, and that there was no chance of another war and that the probability therefore was that he would have to die on a bed. Pax Britannica was nothing to him except an evidence that the Golden Age had passed. He was praying to be allowed to lead his polo team against Bengal politicians, and was promising to do the necessary damage with the handles of the clubs. It is he who is supposed to have said that within a few hours of the British withdrawal from India there would not be *a rupee or a virgin left in Bengal*, or something to that effect. He is a son in spirit of one of those famous Rajput heroes who, finding himself dying, sent to Lanza, Prince of Multan, begging as a last favour ' the gift of battle.'

When the Prince agreed, Rawal's 'soul was rejoiced.' He performed his ablutions, worshipped the gods, bestowed charity, and withdrew his thoughts from the world." (*Note the italics again.*)

So much for the "veracity" of the conversations which are prolific in *Mother India.*

Miss Mayo would make the world believe that blood and feud divide the Princes and people, the people and the Government, whereas rivers of milk and honey flow between the Princes and the Government themselves.

It is dangerous to generalize in regard to any country, especially India. There have been Princes who felt their interests thoroughly identical with those of the people in British India, though I admit they have not been *personæ gratæ* with a class of intriguers whose only business is to tell exasperating stories about the relations between the Princes and the people.

The Nizam of Hyderabad (82,600 square miles), a state nearly as large as Great Britain (88,700 square miles), the Gaekwar of Baroda, the Maharaja of Mysore and the Maharaja of Nabha are outstanding examples of independent States whose rulers co-operate with the politicians in British India, sympathize with their aspirations and look forward to the simultaneous advancement of British India and Native States as an integral part of the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Far from treating with contempt the politician, as Miss Mayo would have the world believe that the ruling chiefs do, His Highness the Gaekwar of Baroda offered the Prime Ministership of the State to Sir Surendranath Bannerjee, who was known as " the uncrowned king of Bengal," during the agitation to annul Lord Curzon's partition of Bengal, but who rose to be a Minister of His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor. If Sir Surendranath could not accept the offer, it was because of his pre-occupations in Bengal. Arabindo Ghose, who took a leading part in the Bengal agitation, was a principal educational officer of the Baroda State. The Maharaja of Mysore had invited Mahatma Gandhi to be the State guest lately. The Nizam of Hyderabad had followed the forward Nationalist policy of Indianizing the services of the State and even eliminating the Europeans, so much so that the subject reached a region of controversy and correspondence between the Nizam and the Viceroy. Maharaja Ripudaman Singh of Nabha is an ideal Indian Prince, who would lend no ear to those who said that Native States and British India should be separated by a Chinese wall, as it were, viewing each other with jealousy and suspicion.

Knowing, as they did, that he possessed a personality and administrative talents of a high order, a tenacity of purpose and a will of his own, the Government decided to bring Maharaja Ripudaman Singh into touch with the administrators by nominating him as a member of the old Imperial

Legislative Council. Instead of coming in intimate contact with the officials, the Yuva Raja, as he then was, came in close touch with the Leader of Opposition in those days, Gopal Krishna Gokhale. He delighted to support with words and votes the Poona agitator on first-class political issues, e.g., opposition to the Seditious Meetings Bill. This was awful, even for an elected aristocrat. That a future ruler of an Indian State and a nominated member of the Government should do so was the limit. Politicians and the public are noted for their short memories, but the class for whom Miss Mayo speaks have long memories, nurse old grievances and do not hesitate, when opportunity comes, to pay off old scores.

The Maharaja had annoyed that class to such a degree that they could neither forgive nor forget. Those were days when the new era of Montagu reforms had not dawned. Even a moderate politician like Gokhale, who delighted to dwell on the benefits of British rule and India's attachment to the Royal House of Windsor, was suspect. By the anti-Indian Press he was considered to be a wily agitator. Like C. R. Das, the Arthur Griffiths of Bengal, a greater, a more gifted and a more self-sacrificing leader than whom India has never produced—and is not likely to produce in a hurry —Gokhale was the recipient of much official applause after his death. If the applause was louder in the case of Das, it was because his sacrifice was more intense, his politics more militant

and his hold on his people real and genuine. Das was an accredited agitator, frankly dangerous. Gokhale was a dangerous diplomat, whose smooth politics, like still waters, were supposed to run deep. And it was with Gokhale that the future Maharaja of Nabha associated. It was Gokhale's politics that he admired. It was Gokhale's views and resolutions which he endorsed in speech and by vote. No wonder Ripudaman Singh was in the bad books of the class to which Miss Mayo speaks long before he was installed on his ancestral *gadi*. They had decided either to bend him or break him, as subsequent events clearly disclosed.

There are Maharajas and Maharajas. Some are politically-minded, far-sighted and independent; others are without views of their own, the victims of intriguing ministers. Some others are non-progressive. Of the last class Lord Sydenham wrote: *

> "A number of leading chiefs, including the Maharajas of Bikaner, Alwar, Patiala, Kashmir and Nawanagar, have conferred with the Viceroy in order to represent their anxieties and just claims which must be taken into full account in any revision of the Constitution."

But the loyalty of the Maharajas, however public-spirited and independent they might be, to the throne of His Imperial Majesty the King of England

* *Nineteenth Century and After*, June 1927.

has been wonderful. India has not produced a greater Nationalist among the ruling chiefs than Maharaja Ripudaman Singh of Nabha. But while he had his differences with the system of government which finally resulted in his forced abdication, his loyalty to King George was unique.

Following the tradition of the House, Maharaja Ripudaman Singh offered £5,000 as a token of gratitude and devotion on the happy occasion of the birthday of King George on June 3rd, 1912, for His Majesty to spend as he deemed fit.

Some of the old-fashioned and superstitious people might have thought that this was too premature an offer to make, especially as both the Maharaja and the Royal Family were still in mourning over his father's demise. But as against this was the enlightened tradition of the West—"The King is dead; long live the King." How could the new ruler of Nabha afford to miss his first opportunity to show his loyalty to his Emperor who was celebrating his birthday, the first of its kind, after his Indian visit, in which His Majesty had touched the hearts of the Princes and the people alike?

That is the attitude of even the boldest spirits among the Maharajas towards England's King, though he had suffered for his differences with the man-on-the-spot. When the war broke out he was the first to place the entire resources of his State, small as it was, at the disposal of the Government.

Surely, when even the proudest, the most advanced and the most independent of the Princes delight to serve their liege and lord the King-Emperor, it is not easy to believe Miss Mayo's stories that the Princes were discussing the expulsion of the British.

CHAPTER XVI

AS OTHERS SEE US

"Above all things raillery decline,
Nature but few does for that task design."

BENJAMIN STILLINGFLEET.

It is agreeable to note that English men and women who have known India and read *Mother India* have felt constrained to speak out their minds. Some of them have been too modest to write over their names, but it is not the person who writes that counts so much as the thing written.

"It is hard for one who knows the simple, affectionate, much-enduring people of India," writes Sir John Maynard, I.C.S. (retired), about Miss Mayo's book:

> "The suggestion that 'a majority of the Hindu population is suffering from venereal disease will be contradicted by any medical practitioner who has practised among them."

Apropos the charge of "filthy habits of Indians,

even the most highly educated classes," an English correspondent writes *:

"My friends were all of the educated classes, not always the most highly educated, yet they all had a bath every morning and considered themselves unfit for Society and unable to touch any food until they had done so: they always washed their hands both before and after each meal, and cleaned their teeth, or at least rinsed their mouths after each meal. Some of their habits of cleanliness, especially in preparing food, strike a European as fastidious to a degree, but they are probably necessitated by the climate, and the ritualistic element in them, no doubt, enforces them among a wider public than would be the case if they were inculcated on sanitary grounds alone."

Regarding child-marriage, the same writer observed:

"I did not come across any child-marriage in the full sense of the term. One of my friends, a youth of eighteen, had, it is true, been married at the age of twelve, yet he had never seen his wife's face although she lived under his father's roof. I have sometimes heard child-marriage defended on the grounds that it is better for the wife to come to live with her father-in-law's family at an early age, in order that she may

* "D.M.L." in *New Statesman*.

grow accustomed to them and become more intimately adopted by them; this, of course, applies to families still living in the joint-family system. But marriage in the physical sense is never consummated (in that section of society of which I have experience) before puberty. There exists at Lahore a college (boarding school) for the daughters of chiefs, both Hindu and Mahommedan, and the fact that they usually remain till the age of sixteen and sometimes more, supports my claim that among the upper classes the custom of child-marriage is becoming obsolete."

Mr. B. G. Horniman, an Englishman who has suffered for India, wrote with righteous indignation:

"That the object is to prejudice Indians in the eyes of Americans in view of the attempt that is being made to secure for Indians the citizenship of the States is obvious and the author's attempt to dissociate herself from propagandist intentions is as insolent as her pretence to have produced a dispassionate description of Hindus. There is already a Bill known as 'the Hindu Citizenship Bill' before the U. S. Congress, introduced by Senator Copeland, following the recent Supreme Court decision depriving Hindus—as Indians are designated in the States—of U. S. citizenship and making them ineligible thereto. Those who have put up Miss Mayo

no doubt calculated the effect on the morbid American mind of representing Indians as the veritable scum of civilization.

"As to the effect of the book on India, we have no misgiving whatever. If Indians have hitherto shown a good-humoured toleration of Americans in India, the feeling of revulsion which the book has already engendered is enough to render them despicable in Indian eyes."

Mr. D. F. McClelland, General Secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, Madras, himself an American, said:

"That a countrywoman of mine should, after a brief stay in India, write so unfairly and offensively of this country is a source of deep humiliation. In many things her accuracy as an observer will not bear scrutiny and many highly exaggerated conclusions give an utterly false picture of India as a whole. I have been in India since 1915 and have moved during those years with all classes. I have no hesitation in protesting vigorously against the unfairness of her book. Generalizations that may be taken for fact by readers abroad are too often the statements of personal opinion based upon prejudice or partial examination. A very offensive book could be written as well of Americans or of any other Western nation and then we, of the West, would rightly protest against such unfair representation."

In the opinion of Sir Reginald Craddock, I.C.S. (retired):

> "The impression of the picture is too dark, because the author has concentrated upon the darkest side. Were the hideous features to be in a large ratio to the whole, nothing could have prevented the extinction of these races during the centuries that have passed since their social system was first evolved. On the contrary, the Hindu social and religious system has thus far resisted the proselytising efforts of Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity. The Hindu joint-family system has counter-balancing merits which account for its tenacity. Within its own narrow circle it produces deep family affection, genuine piety, and remarkable self-sacrifice, to which everyone familiar with the life of the people must bear witness."

The *Capital*, a European weekly of Calcutta, published from the pen of its well-known writer, "Ditcher," who is Mr. Pat Lovatt, its talented editor, an interesting criticism of *Mother India*:

> "In the first place it confirmed the opinion of one of the greatest living essayists, that a 'best seller' nowadays is not, in nine cases out of ten, a good (*sic*); in the next place the intellectual dishonesty of *La grosse Americaine* was appalling; and in the last place, her ghoulish

propensity of frequenting hospitals to discover inhuman cruelties to indict a whole people bordered on stark pornography. The book is devoid of literary merit. It is the crudest form of transpontine journalism. It sold like hot cakes partly because of its morbid sensationalism, but mostly because it was unscrupulous propaganda against the claim of India for Home Rule published at the 'psychological moment.'"

Major Graham Pole, in the course of his review of Miss Mayo's book in the *New Leader*, wrote :

"She is interested in Indian society only where it is unhealthy. She creates her 'atmosphere' in the first chapter with a sketch of what is to us, as well as to many Hindus, a revolting religious rite, although it is not in the least characteristic of India and is practised only by the lowest and most ignorant of Indians. As with religion, so with social customs. To give an idea of marriage in India she has recourse to the hospitals and to the reports of medical authorities, although in the nature of things it is only exceptional cases which come under their notice.

"To write, as she does, that Indian women of child-bearing age, cannot safely venture, without special protection, within reach of Indian men is, to my knowledge, a gross and unfounded slander. If Miss Mayo came to Britain and visited the hospitals she could paint

as dark a picture of British life: if she spent some days in a Police Court there would be very little light and shade in her revelations of British family life. Or, to take her own country, what idea of American civilization could we not derive from that most American product, the film? It is extremely ironical that at a moment when Miss Mayo's book is giving us this appalling picture of Indian civilization, the Government of India have found it necessary to introduce legislation to deal with the importation of American cinema films owing to their demoralizing influence on Indians!"

Let me also place on record the opinion of Mrs. Annie Besant, a nobler and truer friend than whom India has not had, who has identified her interests with those of her adopted Motherland, whose life has been to India and to humanity "a dedicated thing":

"I have spent in India the greater part of my time since 1893, living as an Indian, welcomed in their homes as though I were one of their own people, and I have never come across the horrors she describes. I have myself worked against child-marriage, with the help and support of large numbers of Indians, men and women; everyone knows that the 'first marriage' among Hindus is only a betrothal—though if the boy dies, it makes the young wife a widow—and the girl-wife remains in her parents' house until the

'second marriage' takes place. I have received an advance copy of this book and on opening it I found that the very first division of Part I, called for some unexplained reason, 'The "Bus" to Mandalay,' is devoted to a revolting description of the Kali Ghat Temple. Miss Mayo is conducted through it by a 'Brahman friend,' clad in 'his white petticoat-trousers and his white toga, the usual Bengali costume.' The last words show that the Brahmana wore the dhoti and shawl, but the description reveals the underlying motive of the book, to make ridiculous one of the most graceful and decent costumes ever invented by men."

Last but not least, I may quote the considered opinion of representative Indians, such as Sir A. C. Chatterjee, High Commissioner for India; Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, ex-Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council; Sir Chimmanlal Setalvad, ex-Member of the Executive Council of the Governor of Bombay, Mr. Sachidananda Sinha, ex-Member of the Executive Council of the Governor of Behar and Orissa; Sir M. M. Bhowanagree; Mr. Dube, Barrister-at-Law, practising before His Majesty's Privy Council; Mr. Kamat, Member of the Royal Commission for Agriculture; and all the Indian Members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India, namely, Sir Mahomed Rafique, Mr. S. N. Mallick and Dr. Panjpaye:

"Our attention has been drawn to the recent publication entitled *Mother India* by an American tourist, Miss Katherine Mayo, who paid a visit to India during the cold weather of 1925–26. It has never been our lot to read a book which indulges in such wholesale, indiscriminate vilification of Indian civilization and Indian character.

"We concede that, like other cold-weather tourists, Miss Mayo was entitled to form and express her own opinions. But, when a foreigner who spends not more than a few months in our country uses the material gleaned from hospital cases, culled from criminal trial reports and deduced from her own observations of isolated happenings, and seeks to fortify herself with quotations divorced from context, and then proceeds on such slender basis to formulate a general indictment against the character and culture of a great country like India, possessed of an ancient civilization, it is time that we protested.

"She depicts the entire nation of 320 millions of people as physical degenerates, moral perverts and unabashed liars. If an Indian could have the temerity to pass a similar judgment on any nation of the West, after but a few months' residence in any country in Europe or America, and to indict the Western people, their civilization and character on the strength of the reports

of sensational cases and crimes, moral perversions and physical degeneracy, as evidenced by the proceedings of the courts, hospital and personal experiences, official reports, newspaper paragraphs and other special instances, he would be rightly condemned as unworthy of serious attention.

"It is singular that, whilst the darker side of the Indian life evidently possesses a morbid attraction for Miss Mayo, she has taken absolutely no care to acquaint herself with the many indigenous agencies for propagating social reform and advancing educational progress, that have been at work with far-reaching results for the welfare of the people during the last half a century and more. Nor has she, it would seem, any time to spare to gather information first-hand from Indian leaders of thought and social reformers of repute.

"This is scarcely a place or occasion for us to enter into a detailed refutation of the many wild and mischievous generalizations, with which almost every page of this book is disfigured. We should not have felt called to take any public notice of a book of this character, but when we find that the publication is receiving serious attention and wide publicity in the columns of the British Press, to the obvious detriment of India, at this juncture, we think it our duty to warn the British public against

what strikes us as being a singularly mischievous book."

It is understood that the signatories are arranging to get a general publication for the letter in the British Press.

CHAPTER XVII

"SPADES ARE SPADES!"

'Smite on! It doth not hurt me now;
The spear has lost its edge of pain."

THOMAS C. UPHAM.

MISS MAYO would call a spade a spade. She heads her chapter, "Spades are Spades." So do I; though sometimes I may be permitted to call a spade an agricultural implement! In no case can spades be spears! In fairness, must I state, educated Americans disapprove of the book by Miss Mayo. When I was at Stratford-on-Avon the other day I happened to meet Mrs. Leggate and Miss MacLeod, well-known figures in the societies of England and America. It was in the historical house of Shakespeare's daughter, "Halls Croft," which the American ladies own, that I referred to the unhistoric book of Miss Mayo. Mrs. Leggate exactly understood what Miss Mayo had written: "She visited a few slums and drew conclusions for a whole nation!" Miss Mayo says, not slums only but hospitals also. Accord-

ing to her " one of the most direct means " of knowing the truth about society for " the foreigner in India " is " to visit women's hospitals. This I have done from the Punjab to Bombay, from Madras to the United Provinces." Well might she go to hospitals from China to Peru, and draw the same conclusions for the human race and protest, as she does " Spades are Spades " ! She describes her visit to hospitals as " research." A scientist like Huxley will turn in his grave, because she lays claim to her research being " scientific " ! Science means accurate knowledge and therefore her knowledge on the subject is accurate ; at least she thinks so ; her admirers think so ; and she does not care for others. Hospital statistics are not without their defects, even in most advanced countries. In no case can they be a basis for a general indictment, in a country like India. To understand the defects of hospital statistics where hospitals are comparatively few and the keeping of statistics comparatively undependable, it would not be too much to quote the observations of a British authority, whose competence even the American writer cannot lightly question : *

" In the hope of obtaining information in regard to the incidence of venereal diseases, we addressed forms for completion to cover the period from 1st January to 30th June, 1914, to twenty-eight hospitals spread over the United Kingdom. Having regard to the importance of our inquiry, we consider

* Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases in British Isles, 1916.

it discreditable to the institutions concerned that only sixty-seven replies were received. Although in a few cases much trouble was taken in filling up the forms, the figures obtained are, for various reasons, unsuitable for our purpose, and there can be little doubt that in a large number of hospitals adequate records for statistical purposes are not kept. It appears to us to be highly unsatisfactory that these institutions, which are maintained from funds of a semi-public nature, should be unable to furnish precise information respecting the diseases with which they deal, and we trust that this important question will receive the serious consideration of the managing bodies."

"A very small percentage of Indian women," concludes Miss Mayo, "are well and strong. . . . Venereal infection." A similar conclusion will be formed by foolish people after a visit to the hospitals of New York. Such a conclusion would be wrong. Miss Mayo says that the British surgeon-superintendent told her that the patients had one child, often dead, and that then they were infected with gonorrhoea which had utterly destroyed the pelvic organs.

I do not think it is fair to lay on the British surgeon-superintendent the blame for the conclusions of Miss Mayo. I am prepared to grant that that was the surgeon's experience. Healthy cases do not go to hospitals. Do we not have some of the worst cases in the English hospitals? In my own opinion, the people of England are one of the

two cleanest races on God's earth, the other being, of course, the Indian people. It would be midsummer madness to conclude from the following observations of the British Royal Commission that all English women are venereally infected: "The examination of the serum of pregnant women or the blood from the umbilical cord of the newly-born child in seventy-one Shoreditch cases gave fourteen positive reactions, a percentage of 19.7. In a similar investigation relating to ninety births in St. Pancras, the percentage of positive reactions was found to be 6.6 Dr. Motts points out that whereas in the Shoreditch cases twenty-nine of the mothers were single and positive reactions were obtained in 27.6 per cent. of these cases, the St. Pancras investigation relates entirely to legitimate births. The high prevalence of syphilis among unmarried mothers is thus plainly indicated. The tests in all the above cases were carefully carried out, and the results, although based upon too few cases to justify sweeping generalisations, must be regarded as extremely significant."

Miss Mayo writes that among Indian women ninety per cent. of the pelvic inflammation is of gonorrheal origin. That is her opinion, and she has no statistics to support her.

"'Here,' she continues, as we stop at the bedside of a young girl who looks up at us with the eyes of a hungry animal, 'here is a new patient. She has had several children, all still-

born. This time, because her husband will no longer keep her unless she bears him a living child, she has come to us for confinement. As usual, it is a venereal case.' " If there were a few cases of still-born children in hospitals, can anyone with a sense of proportion generalize from them? The infantile mortality, according to Miss Mayo, is due to venereal infection chiefly. The Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases says: " Table 2, Appendix I., shews the mortality under one year of age per 1,000 births in 1911 and 1912, assigned to 'congenital debility, including premature births,' in the towns and rural districts of England and Wales. It will be noticed that the rural districts do not compare so favourably with the towns as in Table I. and that in Wales the mortality is higher in the country than in the county boroughs. Table 5 gives the infantile mortality from syphilis per 1,000 births in England and Wales distributed between urban and rural counties from 1905 to 1910, discriminating illegitimate infants. The relative immunity from syphilis of the rural areas is strikingly attested by this table, the mortality of all infants being about one-half of that in the urban counties. The mortality of illegitimate infants is from eight to ten times as high as that of the legitimate. This represents a real excess which, however, is perhaps somewhat overstated, owing to the fact that the tabulated cause is more likely to be accurate in the former than in the latter class."

"'Instances,'' says Miss Mayo, "of mental derangement are common enough." And in India, she concludes from these: "Married as a baby, sent to her husband at ten, the shock of incessant use, was too much for her brain." This is sensational propaganda without sense—but are such instances lacking in the West? Says the British Commission: "Insane Non-paralytic Patients.—Out of 951 insane non-paralytic patients, including adult epileptics, idiots and imbeciles, 80, or 8.4 per cent., gave a positive reaction. These figures seem to show, as Dr. Mott suggests, that these forms of insanity are not dependent to any great extent upon previous syphilis."

The Commission further states: "Tests of Patients admitted to Asylums during a Period of Three Months:

"Appendix XIV gives the analysis of tests made for us by the Lister Institute of serum taken from patients admitted, during the three months ending December, 1914, into 14 asylums selected as representing different sections of the population. In all 545 samples were examined, of which 84 gave a positive, 9 a partially positive, and 452 a negative reaction. The positive and partially positive reactions taken together imply a percentage of 17.1 infected persons; positive reactions alone indicate 15.4 per cent." From this you cannot roundly condemn the English nation.

Miss Mayo concludes from the advertisements

appearing in some vernacular newspapers about "Magical drugs and mechanical contrivances" that a whole nation is diseased or impotent. This is very improper. The Royal Commission mentions the cases actually examined, but it would be equally improper to draw a similar conclusion from the following facts:

"SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS.

"44. In addition to the figures published officially, we have received the following statistics specially collated for our information:—

a. *Prevalence of Syphilis among the apparently Healthy Inhabitants of East London.*

"45. The memorandum and tables drawn up by Dr. Fildes (Appendix XII.) summarise the results of 1,002 serum tests made by Professor Bulloch among patients attending the London Hospital, specially selected and having come for treatment 'for reasons wholly unconnected with syphilis.' An attempt was made to inquire into the past medical history of patients who gave a positive reaction; but this was resented and therefore abandoned. In three out of four such cases syphilis was known to have existed.

"The general results of the tests were as follows:—

Sex.	Cases.	Positive Reactions.	Percentage
Males	616	64	10.3
Females	389	20	5.1

"The cases, when classed in quinquennial age-groups, seem to indicate a relation between the incidence of syphilis and age; but Professor Karl Pearson, who examined the figures from a statistical point of view, considered the relation is 'slight,' and that 'far greater numbers' would be needed 'to demonstrate it satisfactorily.'

"46. If these patients can be regarded as a fair sample of such a population, it follows that in a typical working-class population of London at least 8 to 12 per cent. of the adult males and at least 3 to 7 per cent. of the adult females have acquired syphilis. If congenital syphilis were included, or if the total number of patients attending the hospital had been similarly tested, the percentage would certainly have been higher.

b. *Investigations carried out among Employés referred for Medical Report.*

"47. The results obtained by Sir John Collie from the medical examination, spread over 7½ months, of 2,176 men are given in Appendix XIII.

"The examinees were divided into three classes:—

"I. 1,119 disabled by accident or illness, the extent of whose incapacity required report.

"II. 557 apparently in perfect health, but required to pass a medical examination as a condition of employment.

"III. 500 of the same class as II. who submitted to the Wassermann test.

"These tests were performed under the direction of Dr. Mott at the Pathological Laboratory, Claybury, by permission of the Asylums Committee of the London County Council.

"The clinical examination of Classes I. and II. revealed 60 cases, including 4 cases of gonorrhœa, or 3.58 per cent. of venereal disease. Of 491 recorded in Class III., the total cases of syphilis detected by the serum test was 46, or 9.36 per cent. Sir John Collie remarks that 'had the Wassermann test been applied to all, at least an equally high percentage would have been found in Classes I. and II.,' and Class I. might probably have given somewhat higher figures. Of 103 men who had been in the Navy or Army, 18.89 per cent. proved to have been infected as compared with 6.02 per cent. of 343 civilians. 'The average age' of the men examined 'was probably 30 to 33 years; nearly all were married men.' The investigation was necessarily limited in scope, and it dealt only with a somewhat superior class of workers. The prevalence of venereal disease which is indicated seems higher than might have been expected; but having regard to the figures obtained by Dr. Fildes, there is no reason to suppose that the results err on the side of exaggeration. Sir John Collie also points out that the Wassermann

reaction is much less reliable in the tertiary than in the primary and secondary stages, and that it is estimated that at least 15 per cent. of latent cases do not give a positive reaction. Moreover, whilst a positive reaction in the tertiary stage is always significant, a negative is much less so, and a positive reaction sometimes follows two or three fruitless searches. The cases from which Sir John Collie's statistics were computed were only examined once, and it is possible that the results obtained underestimate the incidence of unrecognised syphilis in the community. Incidentally, as Sir John Collie remarks the analysis of the 60 clinical cases in Classes I. and II. shows 'the deadly influence of syphilis' in relation to the industrial community."

The above quotations from the Commissioners' report correspond to observations of a similar kind in Miss Mayo's book. But if men or women come to the same conclusions as Miss Mayo does about a whole nation, though her premises are too feeble, too slender to be taken seriously, they deserve to be sent for medical examination as to their sanity. Of course, in the case of Miss Mayo, she is perfectly sensible and knows exactly what she is saying and why she is saying it. Her motive is frankly propagandist. She wants to make out that India is not fit for political freedom or social equality with the super-Brahminic nations of the West.

"Spades are Spades" the whole world over!

CONCLUSION

"THE preceding chapters of this book state living facts of India to-day. They can easily be denied, but they cannot be disproved or shaken," says *Mother India*. I can only say the same of *Father India*.

We have read in history that Guy Fawkes tried to blow up Parliament. Miss Mayo has done much worse in a subtler way. However, the heart of the people of India is sound. India's loyalty to the Throne is unquestioned. She does not seek to go the way of the United States. What she wants is honourable association with England like Canada as a self-governing member of the British Commonwealth of Free Nations.

Far-sighted Englishmen ages ago knew that this day would come. Macaulay wrote:

"It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown our system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge, they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or retard it—whenever it comes it will be the proudest day in England's history."

Macaulay's England! See India thus!

According to *Mother India*, "East is East and West is West," but it is the object of *Father India* to make all concerned realize that East *plus* West is much the best.

THE END